

PAUL HARTOG

# Polycarp and the New Testament

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

134

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgegeben von  
Jörg Frey, Martin Hengel, Otfried Hofius

134





Paul Hartog

# Polycarp and the New Testament

The Occasion, Rhetoric, Theme, and Unity  
of the Epistle to the Philippians and its Allusions  
to New Testament Literature

Mohr Siebeck



PAUL HARTOG, born 1970; 1993 Master of Divinity Faith Baptist Theological Seminary; 1994 Master of Arts in History Iowa State University; 2000 Ph.D. in Theology (New Testament and Early Christianity) Loyola University of Chicago; currently teaches New Testament studies at Faith Baptist Theological Seminary.

*Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme*

*Hartog, Paul:*

Polycarp and the New Testament / Paul Hartog. - Tübingen : Mohr

Siebeck, 2002

(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament : Reihe 2 ; 134)

ISBN 3-16-147419-8      978-3-16-157476-4 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019

© 2002 by J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), P.O. Box 2040, D-72010 Tübingen.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Druck Partner Rübelmann GmbH in Hemsbach on acid-free paper from Papierfabrik Schleipen and bound by Buchbinderei Schaumann in Darmstadt.

Printed in Germany.

ISSN 0340-9570

## Preface

This present volume is an edited adaptation of my doctoral dissertation, which I defended at Loyola University of Chicago in 1999. I am greatly indebted to Dr. David Aune (now of the University of Notre Dame) who was my dissertation director and who was the original impetus behind the publication of this volume. I further extend my gratitude to my second and third readers, Dr. Thomas Tobin and Dr. Daniel Williams, as well as Dr. Martin Hengel, for their critical observations. I also wish to thank the staff of J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) for their laudable patience and assistance in this project, especially Matthias Spitzner for his editing and Frank Stellmacher for his proofreading. Finally, this volume is dedicated to my wife Alne, my supporter and beloved friend.



## Table of Contents

Preface. . . . .	V
Introduction. . . . .	1
Chapter 1: Review of Past Scholarship on <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	3
Scholarship Prior to 1873 . . . . .	3
The Question of Integrity Since 1873 . . . . .	6
Modern Investigations and Trends. . . . .	10
Critique. . . . .	15
Chapter 2: The Life of Polycarp . . . . .	17
The <i>Martyrdom of Polycarp</i> . . . . .	18
The Date of the Martyrdom. . . . .	22
The <i>Life of Polycarp</i> . . . . .	32
Evidence from Irenaeus. . . . .	35
Encounters with Anicetus, Marcion, and Ignatius. . . . .	41
Chapter 3: Smyrna, Philippi, and Their Churches. . . . .	44
The City of Smyrna. . . . .	44
The Smyrnaean Church. . . . .	47
The City of Philippi. . . . .	53
The Philippian Church. . . . .	56
The Ignatian Journey. . . . .	57
Chapter 4: The Text and Authenticity of <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	61
Polycarp's Writings. . . . .	61
Style of <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	65
Textual Criticism of <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	67
Authenticity of <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	69
Summary of Contents. . . . .	72
Chapter 5: The Background of <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	74
History vs. Effectual History. . . . .	75
Contact Between Polycarp and the Philippians. . . . .	78

The Request to Forward the Philippians' Letter. . . . .	81
The Request for Ignatius' Letters. . . . .	84
The Request for Advice about "Righteousness". . . . .	86
Summary. . . . .	87
Chapter 6: The Problem of Heresy in <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	89
Irenaeus' Anecdote. . . . .	90
Characteristics of the Heresy in <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	95
Traditional Anti-Heretical Warnings . . . . .	101
The Relationship Between Heresy and Avarice . . . . .	106
Chapter 7: The Epistolary Features of <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	109
Greco-Roman Letter Writing . . . . .	109
The Letter Opening . . . . .	111
The Letter Body. . . . .	116
The Letter Closing. . . . .	118
Chapter 8: The Rhetorical Paraenesis of <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	121
Paraenesis and Moral Exhortation. . . . .	121
Paraenetic Elements . . . . .	128
Persuasion, Ethos, and Pathos. . . . .	132
Chapter 9: The Theme of "Righteousness" in <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	135
Introduction of the Theme . . . . .	135
Righteousness and Avarice . . . . .	138
Righteousness and Forgiveness. . . . .	139
Righteousness and Endurance. . . . .	142
Righteousness, Heresy, and Ethics. . . . .	144
Summary . . . . .	145
Chapter 10: The Unity of <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	148
Harrison's Two-Letter Theory . . . . .	149
Critique of Harrison . . . . .	151
Developments of the Two-Letter Theory. . . . .	156
Chapters Nine and Thirteen . . . . .	161
Plausibility of Unity. . . . .	166
Summary . . . . .	169
Chapter 11: New Testament Allusions in <i>Philippians</i> . . . . .	170
Examples of Past Studies. . . . .	170
Finding Quotations and Allusions . . . . .	172
Non-New Testament Material. . . . .	174
Pauline Material . . . . .	177

Synoptic Gospel and Acts Material . . . . .	180
Johannine and General Epistle Material . . . . .	186
Polycarp's Use of Sources. . . . .	190
Summary . . . . .	195
 Chapter 12: Polycarp and Scripture . . . . .	 198
Polycarp's Style. . . . .	198
Polycarp and the Old Testament. . . . .	199
Polycarp and Marcionite Tendencies . . . . .	202
Polycarp and "Scripture". . . . .	203
Polycarp and the New Testament Canon. . . . .	208
 Chapter 13: Polycarp and Paul . . . . .	 216
Polycarp and the Legacy of Paul. . . . .	216
Polycarp and Philippians. . . . .	223
Polycarp and the Pastorals. . . . .	228
Polycarp and "Righteousness" . . . . .	231
Polycarp and the Pauline Collection. . . . .	232
 Conclusion. . . . .	 236
 Bibliography . . . . .	 241
 Index of Authors. . . . .	 263
 Index of Passages . . . . .	 268
 Index of Subjects . . . . .	 279

## List of Abbreviations

<i>ANF</i>	<i>Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325</i>
<i>BGU</i>	<i>Berliner Griechische Urkunden: Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Staatlichen Museen Berlin</i>
<i>LCL</i>	<i>Loeb Classical Library</i>
<i>LSJ</i>	<i>Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon</i>
<i>NHC</i>	<i>Nag Hammadi Codex</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia Cursus Completus Series Graeca</i>
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Cursus Completus Series Latina</i>
<i>P.Oxy.</i>	<i>Oxyrhynchus Papyri (1898– )</i>

## Introduction

The purpose of this study is to ascertain how the evidence of Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* (hereafter abbreviated as *Phil*) may be helpful in answering various questions about the New Testament documents. P. N. Harrison correctly noted the importance of the short, ordinary, seemingly inconsequential *Phil*: "For in no other writing of so early a date do we find definite and certain, or practically certain, cases of indebtedness to 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John, the Pastoral Epistles, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians and 2 Thessalonians."<sup>1</sup> This little letter has raised many questions concerning the use and status of the New Testament in the early and mid-second century, all of which must be addressed.

These questions include the following problems: First, since Polycarp seems to simply string together echoes from past traditions, is he completely unoriginal in his style? Second, why does Polycarp seem to disregard the Old Testament writings? Third, did Polycarp in fact have "Marcionite" tendencies (and therefore avoid the Old Testament)? Fourth, did Polycarp consider texts now in our New Testament to be "Scripture"? Fifth, does Polycarp reveal anything about the process of the collection and canonization of the New Testament writings? Sixth, was Paul's theological legacy temporarily forgotten or discarded by the "catholic" church, represented by leaders such as Polycarp? Seventh, does Polycarp's *Phil* support the hypothesis that the canonical Pauline Philippians is a conflation of several authentic letters, since *Phil* refers to Paul's "letters" (plural) to the Philippian congregation? Eighth, do the similarities between *Phil* and the Pastoral Epistles prove that Polycarp actually wrote the Pastorals? Ninth, does Polycarp's reference to "righteousness" in *Phil* 3.1 reveal a disagreement concerning Pauline theology at Philippi? Tenth, did Polycarp play a role in the formation of the Pauline corpus?

---

<sup>1</sup> P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), 7. Cf. my chapter 11.



Answering these questions is the means by which I will develop my own contribution to the field. But first, I will lay the important groundwork of the occasion, epistolary features, rhetoric, theme, and unity of Polycarp's epistle. Some of the specific discoveries in these foundational examinations will later help answer the questions listed above. Too often, *Phil* has been used as a source in other debates without first thoroughly examining its own background and message.

## Chapter 1

### Review of Past Scholarship on *Philippians*

In many respects, the form of modern patristic scholarship was forged on the anvil of Ignatian and Polycarpian problems.<sup>1</sup> For the first two and a half centuries of modern criticism, Ignatian and Polycarpian studies focused on the authenticity and integrity of the epistles. The turning point of this discussion came in the late 1800's with the publications of T. Zahn and J. B. Lightfoot. Recently, scholars have begun to approach Ignatius and Polycarp with a more varied palette of questions. This overview of scholarship on Polycarp's *Phil* will accordingly be divided into three segments: scholarship prior to 1873, the question of integrity since 1873, and modern investigations and trends.<sup>2</sup>

#### Scholarship Prior to 1873

For centuries the traditional interpretations of Polycarp's *Phil* were accepted uncritically. The first critical appraisal of *Phil* was made by the Magdeburg Centuriators in the fifteenth century.<sup>3</sup> They did not express any doctrinal disagreement with the epistle, but they did comment on its apparently deficient style and unimportant content. They also expressed misgivings that such a work could come from the hand of the eminent Polycarp. But C. Baronius, J. Ussher,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. M. Grant, "The Study of the Early Fathers in Modern Times," chap. in *After the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 3–19.

<sup>2</sup> W. R. Schoedel has written another helpful review of scholarship on *Phil*: W. R. Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna and Ignatius of Antioch," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. II.27.1, ed. W. Haase and H. Temporini (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993): 276–285. Earlier, Harrison provided a helpful *Forschungsbericht* of literature leading up to his publication: Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 27–72.

<sup>3</sup> Centuriatores Magdeburgenses, *Ecclesiastica Historia* (Basel, 1559–74), Cent. II, Cap. X, col. 173–174.

and D. Blondell continued to unquestioningly accept *Phil*'s authenticity and unity.<sup>4</sup>

In 1666, the French Protestant scholar J. Daillé introduced the modern critical question of the authenticity and unity of the letter.<sup>5</sup> Daillé's work on the Ignatian literature had led him to *Phil*. Partly because of Ignatius' teachings on monoepiscopacy and the real presence, Daillé wished to re-assess the authenticity of the Middle Recension of the Ignatian corpus, which had recently been uncovered by J. Ussher and I. Voss.<sup>6</sup> Daillé realized that the principal external evidence of Ignatius' letters was the reference in *Phil* 13. He perceptively noted, however, that chapter 13 implies that Ignatius and his companions are still alive ("let us know anything more certain which you learn about Ignatius and those who are with him"), while chapter 9 seems to signify that Ignatius is already dead and "with the Lord." Based upon this inconsistency, Daillé argued that *Phil* 13 (and its reference to the Ignatian corpus) was a spurious interpolation in an otherwise authentic letter.<sup>7</sup>

Some scholars followed Daillé's theory of interpolation.<sup>8</sup> But defenders of unity and authenticity also entered the fray. In particular, in 1672, the British bishop J. Pearson made the philological argument that behind the Latin *qui cum eo sunt* in chapter 13 lies the Greek tenseless phrase τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ.<sup>9</sup> Pearson also argued that Polycarp wrote after he had heard of Ignatius' martyrdom (*Phil*

<sup>4</sup> C. Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Coloniae Agrippinae: Gymnaci, 1588), ann. 109, cap. 18; J. Ussher, *Polycarpi et Ignatii epistolae*, (Oxford: Licfield, 1644); D. Blondell, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de episcopis et presbyteris* (Amsterdam: Blaev, 1646), 14–16. Blondell accepted *Phil* although he denied the authenticity of the Ignatian epistles. (Polycarp did not challenge Blondell's presbyterianism as did Ignatius.)

<sup>5</sup> J. Daillé, *De scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areopagitae et Ignatii Antiocheni nominibus circumferuntur* (Geneva: Antonii & Tournes, 1666).

<sup>6</sup> As Harrison notes, Daillé cannot "justly be convicted of *consciously* allowing his ecclesiastical prejudices to dictate his verdicts," but "that he did so *unconsciously* seems very probable" (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Letters*, 136).

<sup>7</sup> Daillé, *De scriptis*, 429.

<sup>8</sup> These included: É. Le Moine, *Varia sacra ceu sylloge variorum* (Lugduni Batavorum: Boutesteyn, 1694); W. E. Tentzelius, *Exercitationes selectae in duas partes* (Leipzig, 1692), xllf, 156–160.

<sup>9</sup> J. Pearson, *Vindiciae epistolarum S. Ignatii* (Cambridge: Hayes, 1672), II, 72. Pearson's work was reprinted as *Ss. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt opera*, 2nd ed. (Antwerp: Hugueteranorum, 1698), II.

9), but before he had received any details (*Phil* 13).<sup>10</sup> W. Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, published similar conclusions in 1710, except Wake argued that Polycarp “assumed” Ignatius’ martyrdom.<sup>11</sup>

On the other hand, A. Ritschl proposed additional interpolations in *Phil*.<sup>12</sup> He argued that our present *Phil* lacks unity of purpose and content, that the writer superfluously protests his modesty, that the joyous reception of the martyrs is overdone, and that the references to Ignatius are chronologically at odds with the gnosis which is opposed within the letter. In Ritschl’s reconstruction, the majority of *Phil* was written toward the end of Polycarp’s life (c. A.D. 140–168). Later, an interpolator added 1.1–2; 3; the reference to widows as *θυσιαστήριον θεοῦ* in 4; 9; 11 (from *sicut Paulus docet* to *nos autem nondum cognoveramus*); and 13. Ritschl was followed by several interpreters.<sup>13</sup>

Still others, such as F. C. Baur (1848), A. Schwegeler (1846), A. Hilgenfeld (1853) and T. Keim (1881) contended that all of *Phil* and the entire Ignatian corpus were forgeries.<sup>14</sup> Schwegeler regarded *Phil* as a “shadow” of the Pastoral Epistles, which were written at the same time, (c. A.D. 169) in the same region, and under the same circumstances.<sup>15</sup> To buttress a similarly late dating,

<sup>10</sup> In this respect, he differed from Baronius, Ussher, and Blondell, who maintained that Ignatius was still alive at the composition of *Phil* (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 29–30, 35).

<sup>11</sup> W. Wake, *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers* (Hartford: Parsons and Hills, 1834). “St. Polycarp . . . did not doubt but that Ignatius was dead when he wrote his Epistle to the Philippians. Yet, having not at that time received any certain account of it, and being not absolutely sure, whether he had suffered or no . . . desires the Philippians, who were much nearer to Rome than he was, . . . to send him a certain account of what they knew as to this matter” (ibid., 81–82). On the continent, Hefele penned a response to Daillé (C. J. Hefele, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Laupp, 1842), v, xlix–liv).

<sup>12</sup> A. Ritschl, *Das Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* (Bonn: Marcus, 1857), 584–600.

<sup>13</sup> These included: R. A. Lipsius, *Über das Verhältnis des Textes der drei syrischen Briefe des Ignatius zu den übrigen Recensionen der Ignatianischen Literatur* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1859), 14; O. Pflieger, *Das Urchristentum* (Berlin: Reimer, 1887), 823–825.

<sup>14</sup> A. Schwegeler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung*, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Fues, 1846), 154–159. F. B. Baur, *Die Ignatianischen Briefe und ihr neuester Kritiker* (Tübingen: Fues, 1848), 96, 129. A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Halle: Pfeffer, 1853), 271–274. Idem, “Die Ignatius-Briefe und ihr neuester Vertheidiger,” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 3 (1874): 96–121, 305–345. T. Keim, *Rom und das Christentum* (Berlin: Reimer, 1881), 529–541.

<sup>15</sup> Schwegeler, *Die nachapostolische Zeitalter*, 154.

Hilgenfeld referred to the character of the letter (unbefitting a man like Polycarp) and the nature and number of heretics. Furthermore, he noted that chapter 11 exhorts Christians to pray for the kings (*regibus*), and surmised that *Phil* was written during the joint reign of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius or even Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus.<sup>16</sup>

J. Donaldson (1874) regarded this last argument as weak, but he agreed that *Phil* (though genuine) was written after Polycarp had visited Rome and during the reign of Marcus Aurelius.<sup>17</sup> Donaldson also found Daillé's arguments on the interpolation of chapter 13 to be "irrefragable."<sup>18</sup> He further considered the "Ignatius" in chapter 9 to have been a member of the Philippian church.<sup>19</sup>

### The Question of Integrity Since 1873

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, several eminent scholars argued for the genuineness of *Phil*. T. Zahn, a conservative German Protestant, improved upon Pearson's arguments.<sup>20</sup> F. X. Funk, a German Roman Catholic, followed Zahn.<sup>21</sup> In the English-speaking world, J. B. Lightfoot's massive studies of the Apostolic Fathers appeared in the 1880s; part two (on Ignatius and Polycarp), which he considered to be the "motive" and "core" of the series, was published in 1885.<sup>22</sup> Lightfoot directed his contentions against F. C. Baur's reconstruction

---

<sup>16</sup> Hilgenfeld, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 273–274.

<sup>17</sup> J. Donaldson, *The Apostolical Fathers* (London: Macmillan, 1874), 226–227.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 227.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

<sup>20</sup> T. Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (Gotha: Perthes, 1873). Zahn restated his position in his section of Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn: O. von Gebhardt, A. von Harnack, T. Zahn, ed. *Patrum apostolicorum opera* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1875).

<sup>21</sup> F. X. Funk, *Opera Patrum Apostolicorum* (Tübingen: Laupp, 1881), lxxxiii–xciii; *idem*, *Die Echtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe mit einer literarischen Beilage* (Tübingen: Laupp, 1883), 14–42.

<sup>22</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. II, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1889). Lightfoot had already published some related studies in the *Contemporary Review* while responding to an anonymous volume called *Supernatural Religion*. These studies were later collected into a single volume: *Idem.*, *Essays on the Work Entitled "Supernatural Religion,"* 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1893).

of early Christianity<sup>23</sup> and against the theory that Polycarp's letter was late and written against Marcion. Lightfoot emphasized the external attestation to *Phil*'s authenticity (pointing primarily to the witness of Irenaeus). Following Zahn, Lightfoot observed that *Phil* was remarkably individualistic for an epistle forged merely to be a cover letter for the Ignatian corpus.

The works of Zahn and Lightfoot marked a "watershed" in Ignatian and Polycarpian studies.<sup>24</sup> So cogent were the arguments of Zahn and Lightfoot, that A. von Harnack modified his own views to fit their conclusions.<sup>25</sup> In 1878, Harnack had argued that *Phil*'s rich use of the New Testament, the Marcionite nature of the opponents, and the style of church government all pointed to a post-130 Hadrianic composition.<sup>26</sup> In 1885, Harnack wrote a review of Lightfoot's work and praised it as "the most learned and careful Patristic monograph which has appeared in the nineteenth century,"<sup>27</sup> although he still preferred a post-130 date for *Phil*.<sup>28</sup> By 1897, Harnack changed his view and agreed that Ignatius and

---

<sup>23</sup> Baur's rather Hegelian-like perspective of early Christian history posited "Catholic" Christianity as the synthesis between two opposing views, namely Pauline Christianity vs. a Jewish Christianity represented by several of the earlier apostles (such as Peter). In this reconstruction, works which represented the "Catholic" Church were dated late of necessity, in order to provide adequate time for the synthetic process. See a critique in W. R. Farmer, "Peter and Paul: A Constitutive Relationship for Catholic Christianity," in *Texts and Testaments*, ed. W. E. March (San Antonio: Trinity University, 1980), 219–236.

<sup>24</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 278. Some of the many scholars who concurred included: J. Réville, "Études sur les origines de l'épiscopat," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 22 (1890): 25; E. von der Goltz, *Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894), 7; G. Krüger, "Briefe des Ignatius und Polykarp," in *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, ed. E. Hennecke (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1904), 190–203; K. Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1 (London: Heinemann, 1912), 280–281; K. Bihlmeyer, *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1924), xxxiv–xli.

<sup>25</sup> Pflieger and Hilgenfeld both altered their position from one of forgery to one of interpolation (see overview of the change in Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 66–68).

<sup>26</sup> A. von Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius und die Chronologie der antiochenischen Bischöfe* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1878).

<sup>27</sup> Idem, "Bishop Lightfoot's 'Ignatius and Polycarp,'" *Expositor* 2 (1885): 402–414.

<sup>28</sup> Idem, "Lightfoot on the Ignatian Epistles," *Expositor* 3 (1886): 175–192. "I do not believe it would have occurred to anyone to assign the Epistle of Polycarp to the age of Trajan, if the Ignatian Epistles had not existed" (ibid., 189).

Polycarp wrote between A.D. 110 and 125.<sup>29</sup> And by 1921, Harnack simply placed *Phil* in Trajan's reign.<sup>30</sup>

This is not to imply that all subsequent scholars have accepted the authenticity of *Phil*.<sup>31</sup> In 1910, D. Völter observed that chapter 1 contains grammatical inconsistencies and that the Ignatian letters never mentions the companions Zosimus and Rufus (found in *Phil* 9).<sup>32</sup> Therefore, Völter dismissed the Ignatian references in chapters 1, 9, and 13 as interpolations. Völter contended that six letters of the Middle Recension (all but *Romans*) were the work of a "Theophorus" (who was later known as Peregrinus Proteus, the protagonist in Lucian's satire by that name). A later editor added *Romans* to the collection in the 160s, and appended and embellished the figure of Ignatius (who was actually martyred in Antioch).<sup>33</sup> H. Grégoire published conclusions similar to Völter's in 1964.<sup>34</sup> Grégoire included his views in a larger argument which delayed the first significant persecution of Christians until the time of Marcus Aurelius.

<sup>29</sup> Idem, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, part 1, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897), 381–406.

<sup>30</sup> Idem, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921), 5\* n.4. Harnack continued to maintain an earlier date in *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus, und die anderen vorkonstantinischen christlichen Briefsammlungen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926), 28–35. Similarly, Batiffol came around to an early date (P. Batiffol, "Polycarp," in *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, ed. J. Hastings (New York: Scribner's, 1918)).

<sup>31</sup> Criticisms came quickly. Within a year, Killen wrote against Lightfoot, whom he criticized as "an Episcopalian and ruler of an English diocese": W. D. Killen, *The Ignatian Epistles Entirely Spurious* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1886). For a summary of early negative responses to Lightfoot, see Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 67–72.

<sup>32</sup> D. Völter, *Polykarp und Ignatius und die ihnen zugeschriebenen Briefe* (Leiden: Brill, 1910). Völter argued that Zosimus and Rufus were martyred in Philippi. See the evidence of the *Martyrologium Romanum* (though most likely dependent upon *Phil*) in J. B. Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 19.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Rackl's challenge of Völter's solution to the Ignatian problem: M. Rackl, *Christologie des heiligen Ignatius von Antiochien* (Freiburg: Herder, 1914), 11–86; cf. Harrison's critique in *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 69–70: Völter sometimes failed to differentiate "fact and guesswork," he "combined with his skepticism towards the traditional an equal credulity towards any circumstance, however poorly attested or however conjectural, that seemed to favor his own view"; nevertheless, he must be praised for his "rare courage, independence, and pertinacity," and the reader enjoys the "harmless entertainment" which is mixed with "solid instruction."

<sup>34</sup> H. Grégoire, *Les persecutions dans l'Empire romain*, 2nd ed. (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1964).

In 1927, J. Turmel (Delafosse) constructed an elaborate theory of forgery.<sup>35</sup> According to his view, a Marcionite bishop named Theophorus wrote the majority of the Ignatian corpus, sometime between 135 and 188. After 190, a Catholic Christian edited the collection and fabricated the fictitious character of Ignatius by merging the Marcionite bishop Theophorus with a Catholic martyr from Philippi named Ignatius.<sup>36</sup> The Ignatian fabricator later added *Phil* 13 to authorize his forgeries.

More recently, J. Rius-Camps' study agreed that *Phil* 13 was an interpolation which was added to validate the grand scheme of a conniving Philadelphian bishop.<sup>37</sup> He argued that among the letters of the Ignatian Middle Recension, only *Ephesians*, *Magnesians*, *Trallians*, and *Romans* are authentic. *Philadelphians*, *Smyrnaeans*, and *Polycarp* were counterfeited by the bishop of Philadelphia to bolster his authority. This bishop also interpolated all references to the triple ministry (bishop, elders, deacons) throughout the Ignatian collection.

R. Joly denounced Rius-Camps' fanciful reconstruction and proposed his own theory of interpolations.<sup>38</sup> Joly conventionally argued that chapter 13 and part of chapter 1 are spurious. However, he theorized that the reference to Ignatius in chapter 9 is authentic, but it originally alluded to a Philippian martyr by the name of Ignatius.<sup>39</sup>

In 1936, a *via media* arose in Polycarpian scholarship. P. N. Harrison published his influential *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*.<sup>40</sup> Harrison argued that the apparent contradiction between chapters 9 and 13 had never been satisfactorily harmonized. He proposed the ingenious solution that although *Phil* in its entirety is from the hand of Polycarp, our current text is actually a conflation

<sup>35</sup> J. Turmel, *Lettres d'Ignace d'Antioche* (Paris: Rieder, 1927). Corwin succinctly states, "The argument of Delafosse is more imaginative than convincing. . . . It is a theory which for all its ingenuity can hardly be taken seriously" (V. Corwin, *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch* (New Haven: Yale University, 1960), 7–8).

<sup>36</sup> According to Turmel, Polycarp had mentioned this Philippian Ignatius in his epistle to the Philippians shortly before his death in 166.

<sup>37</sup> J. Rius-Camps, *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, the Martyr* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1979), 87–98.

<sup>38</sup> R. Joly, *Le dossier d'Ignace d'Antioche* (Brussels: Université de Bruxelles, 1979).

<sup>39</sup> Apparently, Joly was unaware of Donaldson's earlier work, which had argued along similar lines (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 228).

<sup>40</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*.



of two Polycarpian letters. Letter 1 (chapters 13 and probably 14)<sup>41</sup> was written c. 115, immediately after Ignatius left Smyrna for Rome. Letter 2 (chapters 1 through 12) was written around 135, and it included warnings against Marcion's early doctrines.<sup>42</sup> Harrison's work has overshadowed the field ever since. L. W. Barnard even considered Harrison's theory to be "established beyond doubt."<sup>43</sup>

Although those espousing inauthenticity and interpolations retain a small following in current scholarship, the field is largely divided between two parties. One group has adopted yet modified Harrison's conflation thesis.<sup>44</sup> Although agreeing that *Phil* is a conflation of two genuine Polycarpian texts, they place the second letter c. A.D. 120 and attach chapter 14 with the first letter. The other contingent continues to defend the unity of *Phil*.<sup>45</sup> I will save the full investigation of this discussion for my chapter 10, where I will address the unity and dating of the epistle in detail.

## Modern Investigations and Trends

Of course, not all early Polycarpian scholarship centered exclusively on the problems of authenticity and integrity. During this time, F. X. Funk published a fine critical edition of *Phil* which became the basis for K. Bihlmeyer's widely

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 206.

<sup>42</sup> For an introduction to Harrison's thesis, see *ibid.*, 15–19. Harrison closed his book with a lengthy chapter on "Polycarp and the New Testament."

<sup>43</sup> L. W. Barnard. "The Problem of St. Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians," chap. in *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background* (New York: Schocken, 1966), 39. This article first appeared in *Church Quarterly Review* 163 (1962): 421–430.

<sup>44</sup> C. J. Cadoux, Review of *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*, by P. N. Harrison, in *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1937): 267–270; H.-C. Puech, Review of P. N. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*, in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 119 (1939): 96–102; Barnard, "Problem." Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 18–21.

<sup>45</sup> For example, cf. W. R. Schoedel, "Polycarp's Witness to Ignatius of Antioch," *Vigiliae Christianae* 41 (1987): 1–10.

used text.<sup>46</sup> P. Meinhold would commend the Funk-Bihlmeyer text as “Die zur Zeit beste Ausgabe.”<sup>47</sup>

Within two decades of Harrison’s important study, two commentaries were issued; both adopted a modified conflation theory. J. A. Kleist attached chapter 14 to the first letter written to the Philippians,<sup>48</sup> and P. T. Camelot stressed an early date for the second letter.<sup>49</sup>

The last three decades have witnessed the publication of three more important commentaries. In 1967, W. R. Schoedel published a study of *Phil* in the Apostolic Fathers series edited by R. M. Grant.<sup>50</sup> Overall, Schoedel’s views were rather conservative. He defended the unity of the epistle; but he did not totally rely on Pearson’s “assumption of martyrdom” theory. Rather, he argued that chapter 9 should not be pressed to imply that Ignatius had already died. The flow of thought in chapter 9 moves from Ignatius and his companions to Paul and the other apostles. Statements at the end of the chapter only apply with certainty to the latter.

H. Paulsen’s 1985 edition and revision of W. Bauer’s earlier work came to similar conclusions.<sup>51</sup> The epistle is authentic, probably unified, and probably not written against Marcion.

<sup>46</sup> F. X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* (Tübingen: Laupp, 1913). Bihlmeyer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, Part 1. Early in the twentieth century, Lake published a Greek/English bilingual text, of which the English translation is still commonly used. Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1. I will use this English translation of *Phil* (which is part of the LCL) throughout this study. His translation is not perfect, as its loose rendering of ἐλπίς (*Phil* 3.3) as “faith” rather than “hope” reveals (*ibid.*, 287). In *Phil* 1.1 he translates the δεξαμένοις loosely as “have followed,” but in the letter opening context, it should be “having received.”

<sup>47</sup> P. Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 21, part 2 (Stuttgart: Druckenmüller, 1952), 1692. Cf. Bauer’s analysis in *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 14–15.

<sup>48</sup> J. A. Kleist, *The Didache, The Epistle of Barnabas, The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, The Fragments of Papias, The Epistle to Diognetus* (Westminster: Newman, 1948).

<sup>49</sup> P. T. Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche, Polycarpe de Smyrne, Lettres, Martyre de Polycarpe*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Cerf, 1951).

<sup>50</sup> W. R. Schoedel, *Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias* (London: Nelson, 1967).

<sup>51</sup> H. Paulsen, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Brief des Polykarp von Smyrna* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985). This volume is based on W. Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920).

From another perspective, J. B. Bauer published *Die Polykarpbriefe* in 1995.<sup>52</sup> Based upon the title, one readily recognizes that Bauer adopted Harrison's two-letter hypothesis.<sup>53</sup> Bauer's introductory material provides helpful discussions about Smyrna, the life of Polycarp, the style of the epistle, text-critical matters, theological themes including eschatology, and the connections between *Phil* and the Pastoral letters and *1 Clement*. M. C. Murray called it "the best all round single volume on Polycarp to date."<sup>54</sup>

Modern scholarship has begun to address new investigations concerning *Phil*. In 1951, H. von Campenhausen argued that the author of *Phil* must also be the author of the Pastoral Epistles.<sup>55</sup> He came to this conclusion after a thorough examination of the style, content, and historical background of the letters. Campenhausen's theory has not won a large following, but it does signify the inclination to move past the question of unity to an analysis of the purpose and rhetoric of *Phil*.

P. Meinhold (1952) attempted to uncover a sustained argument throughout the epistle.<sup>56</sup> Meinhold's analysis maintained that several passages which seem innocuous are actually polemical. For example, the question of "righteousness" in chapter 3 indicates a Philippian debate about Pauline theological terms. The purposeful connection of prophetic themes with the apostolic Gospel in 6.3 reflects a rejoinder to attacks on the Old Testament. Meinhold argued that Polycarp attempted to integrate the practical concerns of heresy and Valens' avarice. Meinhold even theorized that Marcion tried to buy off the church at Philippi (like he later tried at Rome) and that Valens accepted the bribe.

Unlike Meinhold, P. Steinmetz stressed the unity and early dating of the letter.<sup>57</sup> Steinmetz elevated the sin of Valens to the center of the epistle and subordinated anti-heretical polemic. For Steinmetz, the question of "righteousness" was not a debate over Pauline categories, but the moral

<sup>52</sup> Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*.

<sup>53</sup> He uses the two-letter hypothesis, though he acknowledges that "Nirgends scheint das letzte Wort gesprochen" (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 5).

<sup>54</sup> M. C. Murray, Review of *Die Polykarpbriefe*, by J. B. Bauer, in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48 (1997): 326–327.

<sup>55</sup> H. von Campenhausen. *Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1951).

<sup>56</sup> Meinhold, "Polykarpos."

<sup>57</sup> P. Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna über die Gerechtigkeit," *Hermes* 100 (1972): 63–75.

consideration of the sin of Valens. In effect, Steinmetz replaced Meinhold's heresy-avarice duality with the singular problem of avarice.

In 1973, A. Bovon-Thurneysen published an article on the moralism and eschatology of *Phil*.<sup>58</sup> She argued that *Phil* does not explicitly portray the eschaton as having already entered into history in Christ.<sup>59</sup> Accordingly, unlike Paul's dialectic of indicative and imperative as a proper motivation for morality, *Phil* only emphasizes the coming resurrection and judgment.<sup>60</sup> The eschatological has been swallowed up by the ethical.<sup>61</sup> Furthermore, the doctrine of imminence has disappeared in *Phil*.<sup>62</sup>

In 1986, C. M. Nielsen published a short article which argued that Polycarp was indeed responding to Marcion.<sup>63</sup> Earlier scholars who held this view had been confounded by the fact that *Phil* does not refer to Marcion's doctrine of two gods nor to his rejection of the Old Testament. Rather than glossing over these phenomena, Nielsen's response is two-fold. First, Marcion's theological development was not as advanced around A.D. 120. One cannot assume that he had already ascribed to such ideas as the doctrine of two gods. Second, Polycarp

<sup>58</sup> A. Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik und Eschatologie im Philipperbrief des Polykarp von Smyrna," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 29 (1973): 241–256.

<sup>59</sup> Schoedel contends that there is "no sense that in Christ the *eschaton* has already entered into history" in Bovon-Thurneysen's explanation of Polycarpian theology (Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 284). While Bovon-Thurneysen admits that this may be true "Auf den ersten Blick," the "Schon jetzt" of the "Heilszeit" can be recognized in *Phil*'s prescript, though "allerdings mehr indirekt." The joy of the letter opening's "joy expression" is an eschatological joy present in the Philippian church (Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik," 252–254). "In dem Wort von dieser Freude begegnen sich Gegenwart und Zukunft" (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 25).

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 250.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 248. Specifically, Bovon-Thurneysen places *Phil* as a middle link in the development between the New Testament and 2 *Clement* (*ibid.*, 256). At times, she seems to read through filtered lenses. She emphasizes the discontinuity between Polycarp and the New Testament by citing such statements as *Phil* 2.2: "Now he who raised him from the dead will also raise us up if we do his will, and walk in his commandments and love the things which he loved" (*ibid.*, 246–248). She argues that Polycarp has altered eschatology by seemingly making the resurrection conditional upon human works (see also Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 24). But notice the very Pauline nature of *Phil* 1.3 and the related comments in Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik," 247.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 254–256.

<sup>63</sup> C. M. Nielsen, "Polycarp and Marcion: A Note," *Theological Studies* 47 (1986): 297–299. Cf. his earlier work: *Idem*, "Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures," *Anglican Theological Review* 47 (1965): 199–216.

did not attack Marcion's repudiation of the Old Testament because of his own "near exclusion" of the Hebrew Scriptures and because of his own preference for Paul. Thus, Polycarp's condemnation of Marcion was nuanced because he himself also espoused certain Marcionite tendencies.<sup>64</sup>

In 1989, B. Dehandschutter examined *Phil* as an example of early Christian "reception."<sup>65</sup> Dehandschutter began by characterizing the literary genre of *Phil* as "paraenesis." Then he analyzed how Polycarp's reception of Christian tradition affected his paraenesis. Preceding Christian literature served as an authoritative source that influenced *Phil*'s language and thought. Dehandschutter further contended that Polycarp does refer to New Testament documents as Scripture (*Phil* 12.1), not in the sense of "canonized authority," but rather in the sense of "Lehrautorität." Dehandschutter also defended Polycarp against criticisms of unoriginality.

In 1993, H. O. Maier (drawing on the social sciences) argued that *Phil* was not a response to heresy, but a response to the "social chaos" which resulted from Valens' sin of avarice.<sup>66</sup> The main concern of Polycarp's paraenesis was to "promote a purity-preserving and boundary-reinforcing ethos."

K. Berding published an article in 1999 which examined the clustering of Polycarp's Pauline citations and allusions.<sup>67</sup> He concluded that since Polycarp included quotations from 1 or 2 Timothy in two of the three major clusters, he (rightly or wrongly) understood Paul to be the author of these epistles. Berding accepted the two-letter hypothesis, but preferred to date the second letter at 120.

Finally, four studies written for limited but helpful purposes must be mentioned. N. A. Dahl examined the origin and use of the label "firstborn of Satan" in *Phil* 7.1.<sup>68</sup> He traced this epithet to a description of Cain in Jewish

<sup>64</sup> See the fuller discussion in my chapter 12.

<sup>65</sup> B. Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: An Early Example of 'Reception,'" in *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, ed. J.-M. Sevrin (Louvain: Leuven University, 1989), 275–291.

<sup>66</sup> H. O. Maier, "Purity and Danger in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: The Sin of Valens in Social Perspective," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1 (1993): 229–247.

<sup>67</sup> K. Berding, "Polycarp of Smyrna's View of the Authorship of 1 and 2 Timothy," *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 (1999): 349–360.

<sup>68</sup> N. A. Dahl, "Der Erstgeborene Satans und der Väter des Teufels (Polyk 7:1 und Joh 8:44)," in *Aphoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen*, ed. W. Eltester and F. H. Kettler (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), 70–84.

Haggadah (which is also echoed in John 8:44). F. W. Norris summoned Polycarp as evidence against W. Bauer's reconstruction of early Christianity.<sup>69</sup> J. D. Thompson and J. A. Baird assembled a helpful critical concordance to *Phil.*<sup>70</sup> And M. W. Holmes re-examined past interpretations of the text of *Phil* 11.3 and put forth his own reconstruction.<sup>71</sup>

## Critique

A *Forschungsbericht* reveals that past scholarship has been fundamentally impeded in its explications of Polycarp's indebtedness to New Testament literature. On the one hand, interconfessional (and intraconfessional) disputes have often motivated inquiry and prejudiced conclusions, especially in early Polycarpian scholarship.<sup>72</sup> External issues have often dominated the research:<sup>73</sup> Protestantism vs. Roman Catholicism, episcopalianism vs. presbyterianism,<sup>74</sup> apostolic successionism vs. non-successionism, early collection of the New Testament documents vs. late collection, and the whole related Ignatian problem.<sup>75</sup> Cardinal Newman illustrated the battle when he found the entire "Catholic system" in the Apostolic Fathers and denounced those who approached them "with modern or ultra-Protestant notions."<sup>76</sup> Similarly, Batiffol maintained that

---

<sup>69</sup> F. W. Norris, "Ignatius, Polycarp, and 1 Clement: Walter Bauer Reconsidered," *Vigiliae Christianae* 30 (1976): 23–44.

<sup>70</sup> J. D. Thompson and J. A. Baird, *A Critical Concordance to the Epistle of Saint Polycarp to the Philippians* (Wooster: Biblical Research Associates, 1996).

<sup>71</sup> M. W. Holmes, "A Note on the Text of Polycarp *Philippians* 11.3," *Vigiliae Christianae* 51 (1997): 207–210.

<sup>72</sup> See description in Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 294–298.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. the critiques of Lightfoot, Harrison, and Corwin. Lightfoot, *Essays*, 61–62. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 32; Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 6.

<sup>74</sup> As Lightfoot noted, "The name of Ignatius is inseparably connected with the championship of *episcopacy*" (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 389).

<sup>75</sup> Harrison bemoans the "unfortunate effects" of the "preoccupation with the Ignatian controversy" on Polycarpian studies (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 34).

<sup>76</sup> J. H. Newman, "The Theology of the Seven Epistles of St. Ignatius of Antioch" in *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. 1 (London: Pickering, 1873), 222–262. This essay was first published in 1838.

"l'église naissante est catholique."<sup>77</sup> On the other hand, many Protestants believed that the Ignatian and Polycarpian letters simply could not be authentic, since they seemingly supported certain Catholic doctrines. Yet affairs began to change in the past century: "Catholic scholars are less defensive in their attitude and Protestant scholars less aggressive in their criticism."<sup>78</sup>

On another level, many past authors seem to have believed that if they could merely make a list of the quotations and allusions in *Phil* they would have discovered which works Polycarp considered authoritative, which works Polycarp was unaware of, which works were his favorites, etc. This entire simplistic process omits the foundational examinations of the background, purpose, audience, and structure of the epistle.<sup>79</sup> There is a new call for "an approach that attempts to read the apostolic fathers sympathetically in terms of their own limited intentions and concerns and that takes seriously the particular situations and circumstances in which and for which they are writing."<sup>80</sup> Scholars have intensified such approaches in regard to Paul's epistles, and the time has come for a similar approach to Polycarp. Before fully addressing the issue of Polycarp's use of the New Testament writings, we must investigate these underlying problems. For example, epistolary and rhetorical criticisms have never been adequately applied to *Phil*, nor have the historical background and theme of the letter been fully integrated with an investigation of its use of the New Testament. Only after such preliminary analyses may we return to examine the questions listed in the introduction of this study.

---

<sup>77</sup> P. Batiffol, *L'église naissante et le Catholicisme* (Paris: Gabalda, 1909), ix, 157–171. Like many Catholic scholars of his era, he was challenging the contemporary view that "early catholicism" was a corrupt and distorted development of primitive Christianity. Contrast the more balanced statements of Grant (R. M. Grant, *The Formation of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 11).

<sup>78</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 314.

<sup>79</sup> Parroting the party line, Grant wrote, "In fact the only literary interest of Polycarp's epistle is to be found in its quotations" (R. M. Grant, "Polycarp of Smyrna," *Anglican Theological Review* 28 (1946): 138).

<sup>80</sup> M. C. de Boer, "Comment: Which Paul," in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. W. S. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University, 1990), 47.

## Chapter 2

# The Life of Polycarp

Polycarp is a key figure in the early Church because he is an important link between the late first century and the middle of the second century.<sup>1</sup> A reconstruction of the life of Polycarp must begin with two sources: the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* and the writings of Irenaeus. Other important sources include Ignatius' *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans*, Ignatius' *Epistle to Polycarp*,<sup>2</sup> and Polycarp's *Phil.* The material about Polycarp found in Tertullian and Eusebius seems to come from these earlier sources and does not contain independent traditions.<sup>3</sup> Another source, the *Life of Polycarp*, is usually considered to be largely unhistorical.<sup>4</sup> Recently, F. W. Weidmann has published a further source, an edition of the brief "Harris Fragments" on Polycarp.<sup>5</sup> Weidmann concluded that these fragments (extant only in Coptic) were originally written in Greek in or around Smyrna between the third and sixth centuries.<sup>6</sup> They greatly resemble the traditions found in the *Martyrdom*, but there are a few idiosyncracies.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The History of the Christian Church from Earliest Times to A.D. 461*. 6th ed. (London: Allen and Unwin, 1914), ix.

<sup>2</sup> Ussher deemed Ignatius' *Polycarp* to be spurious on the basis of Jerome's statement that Ignatius sent only one letter to Smyrna. However, Ussher's position derived from a confusion advanced by Jerome in *De viris illustribus*, 16. See H. T. Andrews, "Polycarp," in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1911).

<sup>3</sup> There may be a few possible minor exceptions. Eusebius does add that Papias was a companion of Polycarp (*Historia ecclesiastica* V.39.4), though he may be merely grouping individuals together. Grant uses Polycrates' testimony in Eusebius' work to infer that Polycrates was a relative of Polycarp (*Historia ecclesiastica* V.24.2-7; see Grant, "Polycarp," 140).

<sup>4</sup> See the discussion later in this chapter.

<sup>5</sup> F. W. Weidmann, *Polycarp and John: The Harris Fragments and Their Challenge to the Literary Tradition* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1999). Lightfoot includes a helpful discussion of various minor fragments of tradition from the ancient period (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 552-577).

<sup>6</sup> Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*, 147. See also *ibid.*, 11.

<sup>7</sup> For example, the "Harris Fragments" contain the unique traditions that Polycarp was accused of practicing magic, that he died when he was one hundred and four years old, and that his



## The *Martyrdom of Polycarp*

The *Martyrdom of Polycarp*<sup>8</sup> was written by the church in Smyrna to the church in Philomelium.<sup>9</sup> The document is the earliest extant martyrdom narrative, as well as our oldest witness to the cult of the martyrs (17.3; 18.2).<sup>10</sup> The work, largely preserved in Eusebius, narrates the story of the death of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna (cf. *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.15–25).<sup>11</sup> It stresses that martyrdom is an imitation of Christ by drawing parallels between the crucifixion of Jesus and the martyrdom of Polycarp.<sup>12</sup>

Donaldson believes that interpolations and changes in the *Martyrdom* “completely damage” the historical character of the work to the point that the

---

martyrdom was interpreted as a substitute for the non-martyrdom of the Apostle John. For a discussion of all the differences, see *ibid.*, 53–58.

<sup>8</sup> For an introductory review of the bibliography to the *Martyrdom*, see B. Dehandschutter, “The Martyrium Polycarpi: A Century of Research,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.27.1, ed. W. Haase and H. Temporini (Berlin: de Gruyter, 193), 485–522.

<sup>9</sup> Some early scholars argued that the letter was composed about a century after the events. Keim pointed to the late perspective of the writer (*Martyrdom* 15.1; 16.1–2; 19.1), the similarities with the Gospel accounts, the supposed Montanism of Quintus (*Martyrdom* 4), the apparent warning against exaggerating the cult of the martyrs, and the idealization of Ignatius (T. Keim, *Aus dem Urchristenthum* (Zürich: Fussli, 1878), 90ff). Cf. H. J. Holtzmann, “Das Verhältniß des Johannes zu Ignatius und Polykarp,” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 22 (1877): 187–214; J. Réville, *De anno dieque quibus Polycarpus Smyrnae martyrium tulit* (Geneva: Shuchardt, 1880). As Salmon rightly castigates, such a view seems to require “a great stretch of critical credulity” (G. Salmon, “Polycarpus,” in *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines, During the First Eight Centuries*, ed. W. Smith and W. Wace (London: Murray, 1911).

<sup>10</sup> For a brief discussion of the transformation in meaning of “martyr” evident in the *Martyrdom*, see Schoedel, “Polycarp of Smyrna,” 356; Dehandschutter, “Martyrium Polycarpi,” 508–514.

<sup>11</sup> The two families of Greek manuscripts can be divided into Mosquensis 390/Eusebius and Baroccianus 238/Chalcensis 95/Hieroslymitanus S.sep. 1/Parisinus gr. 1452/Vindobonensis gr. 3. For a brief discussion of the textual criticism of the *Martyrdom*, see Dehandschutter, “Martyrium Polycarpi,” 486–490.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *Martyrdom* 1.1–2; 6; 7; 19.1. Dehandschutter, however, stresses that this imitation is not so much “identification with Christ” as an “expression of the will of God” (B. Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi* (Louvain: Universitaire Pers Leuven, 1979), 508–514). For a discussion of the Gospel parallels, see *ibid.*, 503–507.

reader has “no security for any one fact in it,”<sup>13</sup> but most modern scholars are not as pessimistic. Its simplicity and straight-forward nature distinguish it from other, later *martyria*. Most contemporary interpreters find at least a historical core in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*.

Many scholars have expressed doubts concerning the integrity of the text.<sup>14</sup> Müller attempted to produce a text which was free from hagiographical idealization and miraculous events.<sup>15</sup> Campenhausen has continued to argue that the work contains numerous interpolations. According to his reconstruction,<sup>16</sup> the many layers of the *Martyrdom* include (1) pre-Eusebian anti-Montanist additions and warnings against an exaggerated veneration of martyrs,<sup>17</sup> (2) the addition of miraculous events (most are pre-Eusebian, but the dove scene material <chapter 16.1> is post-Eusebian), (3) a post-Eusebian Gospel redactor who stresses the imitation of Christ,<sup>18</sup> and (4) the addition of chapters 21 and 22.2–3 (possibly by the Gospel redactor).

---

<sup>13</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 218.

<sup>14</sup> Buschmann ties these doubts especially to the parallels κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, the inclusion of miraculous elements, and the chronological appendix in chapter 21 (G. Buschmann, *Das Martyrium des Polykarp* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 37).

<sup>15</sup> H. Müller, “Aus der Überlieferungsgeschichte des Polykarp-Martyrium” (Ph.D. diss., University of Paderborn, 1908); idem, “Das Martyrium Polycarpi: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Heiligengeschichte,” *Römische Quartalschrift* 22 (1980): 1–16. He was opposed by H. Baden, “Das Polykarpmartyrium,” *Pastor Bonus* 24 (1911): 705–713; 25 (1912): 71–81, 136–151.

<sup>16</sup> H. F. von Campenhausen, *Bearbeitungen und Interpolationen des Polykarpmartyriums* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1963).

<sup>17</sup> More recently, Tabbernee has shown that Montanists may have been no more zealous for martyrdom than “mainstream” Christians (see W. Tabbernee, “Early Montanism and Voluntary Martyrdom,” *Colloquium* 17 (1985): 33–44). See also G. Buschmann, “Martyrium Polycarpi 4 und der Montanismus,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 49 (1995): 105–145. Campenhausen’s work, of course, was unable to take this recent scholarship into consideration.

<sup>18</sup> This relates to Campenhausen’s theory of the transformation of martyrdom from *Nachfolge* in the earliest church to *Nachahmung*: H. von Campenhausen, *Die Idee des Martyrium in der alten Kirche*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964). For a brief discussion of the theology of martyrdom in the *Martyrdom*, see Dehandschutter, “Martyrium Polycarpi,” 508–514.

Campenhausen's theory was developed by Conzelmann,<sup>19</sup> but most other scholars limit the number of interpolations.<sup>20</sup> Common contenders for interpolations include the account of a dove flying from Polycarp's chest when stabbed in 16.1,<sup>21</sup> the expression "the catholic church" (ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία) in 16.19,<sup>22</sup> the desertion of (the supposedly Montanist) Quintus in 4, and the apparent criticism of an excessive cult of the martyrs in 17–18.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> H. Conzelmann, *Bemerkungen zum Martyrium Polykarps* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 41–58. Conzelmann finds even more interpolations than Campenhausen. He maintains that the *Urform* of the account was a narrative of all twelve martyrs; the narrative was redacted to celebrate the martyrdom of one of the individuals (Polycarp). Other adaptations of Campenhausen can be found in P. Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 553–554; H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. 2: *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 345–347.

<sup>20</sup> See W. H. C. Frend, Review of *Bearbeitungen und Interpolationen des Polykarp Martyriums* by Hans Frhr. von Campenhausen, in *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 9 (1958): 370–373. Frend concludes, "At the moment it looks as though von Campenhausen has put forward some convincing hypotheses while not entirely proving his case" (ibid., 372). Other initial responses to Campenhausen's theory included: H. I. Marrou, Review of *Bearbeitungen und Interpolationen des Polykarp Martyriums* by H. von Campenhausen, in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 84 (1959): 361–363; T. D. Barnes, "Pre-Decian Acta Martyrum," *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968): 510–512; W. Rordorf, "Martyre et Témoignage: Essai de réponse à une question difficile," in *Liturgie, Foi et Vie des premiers Chrétiens* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), 381–405; H. Musurillo, *Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), xiii–xiv.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. W. Reunig, *Zur Erklärung des Polykarp Martyriums* (Darmstadt: Winter, 1917): 1ff. This is one addition Lightfoot was inclined to accept (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 390–393). Eusebius does not reproduce this material.

<sup>22</sup> Andrews, "Polycarp"; but cf. the defenses of Battifol and Salmon (Battifol, "Polycarp"; Salmon, "Polycarpus"). This issue has obviously been influenced by Protestant-Catholic debates. Lightfoot argued that the more original reading was probably ἀγίας, not καθολικῆς (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 621–626). But Ignatius had already referred to the καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία in *Smyrnaeans* 8.2.

<sup>23</sup> Stuiber argues that the concept of *dies natalis* cannot come from the second century (A. Stuiber, "Geburtstag," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 9 (1973), 217–243, esp. 229–230). Schoedel finds limited interpolations in 6.2–7.1a; 8.1; 9.1–2a; 16.1; 17.2–3; 21; 22. These additions include the notice of "a great Sabbath" and the dove flying from Polycarp (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 47–85). Schoedel concludes that no interpolations exist in the early chapters, including the Quintus episode.

Lately, several authors have defended the *Martyrdom* in its entirety.<sup>24</sup> Barnard advocates the authenticity of the Quintus episode and contends that the cult of the martyrs present in the *Martyrdom* can be placed contextually in the second century.<sup>25</sup> He further compares Polycarp's prayer (*Martyrdom* 14) with second-century liturgical traditions. Dehandschutter also provides a lengthy justification of the mid-second century setting of the martyr idealization.<sup>26</sup> Like Barnard, he demonstrates how Eusebius himself acts as redactor (and therefore cannot be used as the criterion of the "original" text), and he denounces the view that the original *Martyrdom* must have merely narrated the events without theological interpretation.<sup>27</sup> He also adds a defense of the dove-scene's place in the original text.<sup>28</sup> Saxer further defends the work, especially the veneration of martyrs in chapters 17–18.<sup>29</sup>

Polycarpian scholarship is still divided on the presence of interpolations in the *Martyrdom*. However, even if the work is a document which developed through some editorial process, it is still a valid source for the historical reconstruction of the event,<sup>30</sup> and the following synopsis could be ascertained under any major theory: For some unstated reason, a persecution of Christians broke out in Smyrna in the middle of the second century, and eleven Christians were

---

<sup>24</sup> Barnard and Dehandschutter have marshalled conservative responses. See L. W. Barnard, "In Defence of Pseudo-Pionius' Account of Saint Polycarp's Martyrdom," in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. P. Granfield and J. A. Jungmann, vol. 1, (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 192–204; Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi*. Barnard defends the Quintus episode; Dehandschutter defends the narration of the dove.

<sup>25</sup> Barnard, "In Defence," 192–204.

<sup>26</sup> Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi*, 131–155, 28–281; idem, "Martyrium Polycarp," 495–497.

<sup>27</sup> Idem, *Martyrium Polycarpi*, 279. Cf. T. Baumeister, *Die Anfänge der Theologie des Martyriums* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1980), 294–295.

<sup>28</sup> Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi*, 72–79.

<sup>29</sup> V. Saxer, "L'authenticité du 'Martyre de Polycarpe': Bilan de 25 ans de critique," *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome, Antiquité* 94 (1982): 979–1001; esp. 992–999. Saxer believes that one may perhaps accept the interpolation of the dove in 16.1 and the name Alce in 17.2 (cf. Ignatius, *Smyrnaeans* 13.2; *Polycarp* 8.3). Karpinsky also refutes Campenhausen's late dating of *Martyrdom* 18.3 (P. Karpinsky, *Annua dies dormitionis* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1987), 40–64).

<sup>30</sup> J. N. Bremmer, "Some Observations on the Martyria of Polycarp and Pionius," *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985): 110–130; cf. Musurillo, *Acts*, I–lvii.

martyred.<sup>31</sup> But a further demand arose among the unsatiated crowd: “Away with the atheists. Let search be made for Polycarp.” Meanwhile, Polycarp had been persuaded to retire to a farm outside the city. A troop of mounted police, given directions by a tortured servant boy, found the elderly bishop in the upper room of a small cottage on a farm outside the city. The soldiers allowed Polycarp to maintain a prayer vigil before arresting him. Afterward, they set him on a donkey and took him to the city. There he was placed in a carriage with the chief of police and the chief’s father. They pressed Polycarp to swear, “Caesar is Lord” and to throw incense on a pagan altar. After repeated refusal, he was thrown down from the carriage, and he scraped his shin. Finally, he was brought in front of the riotous crowd gathered in the stadium. The proconsul insisted, “Swear, and I will set you free. Revile Christ.” But Polycarp responded, “Eighty-six years I have served God, and He has done me no wrong. How then can I speak evil of my King, who saved me?” After repeated threats, the mob insisted that Polycarp should be burnt alive. A pyre was quickly made of timber and faggots, and Polycarp was tied to the post. He offered a final prayer of praise and thanksgiving, and the fire was set ablaze. When the fire could not finish the job, the executioner was ordered to stab him, and Polycarp died. Even his remains were incinerated, and the Christian community was only allowed to gather his bones.

### The Date of the Martyrdom

According to *Martyrdom* 21, Polycarp’s death transpired on a “great Sabbath (τὸ μέγα σάββατον).” However, this expression remains problematic,<sup>32</sup> and no definitive explanation has been given of the phrase. Donaldson takes the “great Sabbath” to refer to the Sabbath preceding Passover,<sup>33</sup> but this appears to be a medieval Jewish use.<sup>34</sup> Lightfoot maintains that the “great Sabbath” was actually

---

<sup>31</sup> *Martyrdom* 19.1 implies that the eleven were Philadelphian Christians. The mob action may have been tied to the League-festival of the Province (ibid., 356; Salmon, “Polycarpus”).

<sup>32</sup> Dehandschutter provides an introduction to the problem (Dehandschutter, “Martyrium Polycarpi,” 497–502).

<sup>33</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 218.

<sup>34</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 61.

Purim.<sup>35</sup> Abrahams argues that the phrase was an unhistorical assimilation to John 19:31.<sup>36</sup> Harrison notes that some Christians (as evidenced two centuries later) used the term to refer to the Saturday after Good Friday.<sup>37</sup> Nevertheless, this interpretation does not seem to fit the Quartodeciman setting.<sup>38</sup> Schoedel surmises that the phrase may be a later redactional addition.<sup>39</sup> Rordorf explains the “great Sabbath” as the concurrence of a Saturday and the *Terminalia* festival.<sup>40</sup> Brind’Amour points out that sometimes the label τὸ μέγα σάββατον was used of Sunday in the early church, as opposed to Saturday (τὸ μικρὸν σάββατον).<sup>41</sup> Dehandschutter calls Brind’Amour’s solution “much easier,” but notes the late (fourth-century) evidence (Epiphanius, *Expositio fidei* 24 and *Panarion* VIII.6.8).<sup>42</sup> Recently, Bowersock (followed and expanded by Cacitti) has maintained that the reference to the “great Sabbath” has a theologically symbolic

---

<sup>35</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 711–713.

<sup>36</sup> I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1924), 67–69. Cf. R. A. Lipsius, “Der Märtyrertod Polykarps,” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 17 (1874): 205.

<sup>37</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 271. Cf. C. F. Crusé’s edition of Eusebius: *The “Ecclesiastical History” of Eusebius of Pamphilus, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine* (New York: 1892), 133 n.1.

<sup>38</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 61.

<sup>39</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 61–62. Schoedel also maintains that it is “likely” to be an assimilation to John 19:31 (*ibid.*, 61). Grégoire and Orgels agree with the assimilation, but contend that only the word μέγα is a later addition (H. Grégoire and P. Orgels, “La véritable date du martyre de S. Polycarpe (23 février 177) et le ‘Corpus Polycarpianum,’” *Analecta Bollandiana* 69 (1951): 1–38).

<sup>40</sup> W. Rordorf, “Zum Problem des ‘Großen Sabbats’ im Polykarp- und Pioniusmartyrium,” in *Pietas: Festschrift für Bernhard Kötting*, ed. E. Dassmann and K. S. Frank (Münster: Aschendorff, 1980), 245–249. Rordorf uses this interpretation to explain the attendance of both pagans and Jews at the martyrdom. But would Jews attend such an event on the Sabbath?

<sup>41</sup> P. Brind’Amour, “La date du martyre de saint Polycarpe (le février 167),” *Analecta Bollandiana* 98 (1980): 456–462. See G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 1220. Devos at first favored the view but then recanted (P. Devos, Review of *Atti e passioni dei Martiri, Au près des saints corps et âme*, and *Étude sur les Gesta Martyrum romains*, in *Analecta Bollandiana* 107 (1989): 212–215; *idem*, “‘MEΓΑ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ’ chez saint Épiphané,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 108 (1990): 293–306).

<sup>42</sup> The martyrdom of Pionius also reportedly took place on February 23, on a “great Sabbath.” But the manuscripts differ in placing the event in 250 (Saturday) and 251 (Sunday). See Brind’Amour, “La date,” 460.

rather than historical significance.<sup>43</sup> In sum, no single theory can be indubitably established in regard to the “great Sabbath,” and it would seem premature to anchor one’s dating of Polycarp’s martyrdom upon such a mysterious phrase.

A larger issue surrounds the year of Polycarp’s martyrdom, and a debate swirls about this point as well.<sup>44</sup> There are basically three schools.<sup>45</sup> A first, small group, places the martyrdom on February 23, 177.<sup>46</sup> The primary reason for this placement is Eusebius’ connection between Polycarp’s death and the deaths of the martyrs of Lyons and Vienne (*Chronicon* 20.222; 47.205), which most scholars date to 176/177.<sup>47</sup> They theorize that a *lapsus calami* changed the 17th year of Marcus Aurelius in the *Chronicon* into the 7th year (changed from A.D. 177 to A.D. 167).<sup>48</sup> These scholars maintain that the Quintus episode (*Martyrdom* 4) reveals the influence of Montanism, and that both the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* and the letter from Lyons and Vienne are anti-Montanist and therefore must be dated

<sup>43</sup> G. W. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1995). R. Cacitti, *Grande Sabato* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1994). See comparison in W. H. C. Frend, “Christianity in the Second Century: Orthodoxy and Diversity,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48 (1997): 308–309.

<sup>44</sup> No longer may we echo Harnack, “denn kaum über irgend ein anderes Datum der ältesten K<irchen>-Geschichte herrscht heute solch’ ein Einverständnis wie darüber, daß Polykarp am 23. Febr. 155 gemartert worden ist” (A. von Harnack, *Die Chronologie der alchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, part 1, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897), 334–335).

<sup>45</sup> Donaldson, writing in 1874, stated that various scholars had already placed Polycarp’s martyrdom at 147, 155, 161, 166, 169, 175, and 178 (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 223–224). For a brief summary, see G. A. Brisbee, *Pre-Decian Acts of Martyrs and Commentarii* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 119–121.

<sup>46</sup> Grégoire and Orgels, “La véritable date,” 1–38.

<sup>47</sup> Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.inscr. places the Lyons persecution in the seventeenth year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius (A.D. 177). Brind’Amour leaves the question open whether the Lyons martyrs died in 167 or 177 (Brind’Amour, “Date,” 460).

<sup>48</sup> Its defenders further conjecture that Irenaeus delivered a report of the Lyons and Vienne incident to Rome, and that he received a vision of Polycarp’s martyrdom at that time (cf. the Mosquensis Epilogue to the *Martyrdom*). Cf. Meinhold’s scathing evaluation of this hypothesis (Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1678). Even Telfer, who highly regards Grégoire’s thesis, believes he is inconsistent and goes “too far” in using a supposedly “authentique fragment d’Irénee” in the Mosquensis epilogue: “And it is unreasonable to depreciate the ‘Ps-Pionian’ appendixes and yet give high historical value to this feature because it fits with the date A.D. 177 for Polycarp’s death” (W. Telfer, “The Date of the Martyrdom of Polycarp,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1952): 82).

after A.D. 170.<sup>49</sup> However, such an argument is based upon a questionable assumption which portrays Montanists as more zealous for martyrdom than “mainstream” Christians.<sup>50</sup> The dating also fits Grégoire’s overall scheme of placing the first persecution of Christians during the reign of Marcus Aurelius.<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless, this late dating of Polycarp’s martyrdom is difficult to reconcile with his relationship with Ignatius, and Grégoire ends up abandoning the authenticity of the Ignatian letters. Overall, the dating of A.D. 177 has not won much favor.<sup>52</sup> As Meinhold concludes, “. . . die neue Datierung eine Fülle neuer Unwahrscheinlichkeiten heraufführt, ohne die bisherigen Probleme wirkliche befriedigend lösen zu können.”<sup>53</sup>

A second group follows Eusebius’ *Historia ecclesiastica* and places the martyrdom around A.D. 166 or 167.<sup>54</sup> In this work, Eusebius places the

<sup>49</sup> See Meinhold’s critique of this position (Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1678–1679). See also Buschmann, “Martyrium Polycarpi 4,” 105–145.

<sup>50</sup> For a refutation of this view, see Tabbernee, “Early Montanism,” 33–44.

<sup>51</sup> Grégoire, *Les persécutions*.

<sup>52</sup> The placement is followed by J. Moreau, *Die Christenverfolgung im römischen Reich*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1971), and by Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 227–229 (though Camelot changes his position in the 4th ed, 199–200). Völter also defends the date by emending *Martyrdom* 21 to read “Urinatius” instead of “Statius” (Völter, *Polykarp und Ignatius*, 2–4); cf. W. Schmid, “Die Lebensgeschichte des Rhetors Aristides,” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, N.F. 48 (1893): 53–83). This appears to be an attempt to back a reconstruction with an unwarranted emendation. Griffe and Meinhold immediately opposed the 177 dating (E. Griffe, “A propos de la date du martyre de S. Polycarpe,” *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 54 (1953): 178–181; Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1674). Strobel keeps the anti-Montanist interpretation, but dates the work to 166 (A. Strobel, *Das heilige Land der Montanisten* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980), 11 n.4, 51). Schwartz’ late dating (post-169) of the *Martyrdom*, based upon its supposed dependence on the *Death of Peregrinus* by Lucian, has found little support (J. Schwartz, “Note sur le martyre de Polycarpe de Smyrne,” *Revue d’histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 52 (1972): 331–335; cf. Völter, *Polykarp und Ignatius*, 204–209).

<sup>53</sup> Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1678–1679.

<sup>54</sup> Turmel, *Lettres d’Ignace d’Antioche*; Nautin, “Polycarp,” in *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, ed. A. Di Berardino, trans. A. Walford (New York: Oxford University, 1992); E. J. Goodspeed and R. M. Grant, *A History of Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1966), 19–20, 25; Keim, *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, 90; K. G. Wieseler, *Die Christenverfolgungen der Cäsaren bis zum dritten Jahrhundert* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1878), 34; Telfer, “Date,” 79–83; H.-I. Marrou, “La date du martyre de S. Polycarpe,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 71 (1953): 5–20; Campenhausen, *Bearbeitungen*, 5–7; W. H. C. Frend, “Note on the Chronology of the Martyrdom of Polycarp and the Outbreak of Montanism,” in *Oikoumene, Studi*



martyrdom in the seventh year of Marcus Aurelius' reign<sup>55</sup> and associates it with the persecution in Lyons and Vienne and near the death of Justin Martyr (*Historia ecclesiastica* IV.13–19).<sup>56</sup> A 167 setting provides plenty of time for Polycarp to visit Anicetus in Rome (who became bishop around 154/155). Furthermore, a "great Sabbath" may refer to Sunday, and February 23, 167 was in fact the first day of the week.<sup>57</sup> Others prefer Saturday, February 23, 166.<sup>58</sup>

The third group places the event in or around 155.<sup>59</sup> It is certainly true that Eusebius sometimes places events under certain emperors which occurred at other times.<sup>60</sup> As a case in point, Eusebius places Pionius' martyrdom in the same period of time as Polycarp's. Although Jerome follows Eusebius' chronology, modern scholars almost unanimously agree that Pionius was a later bishop of

*paleocristiani pubblicati in onore del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II* (Catania: Università de Catania, 1964): 499ff; E. Burton, Introduction to *The Apostolic Fathers*, by W. Wake (Edinburgh: Grant, 1909), 41. Brind'Amour, "La date," 456–462. Bauer comments, "so kommt man heute mit einiger Sicherheit auf das Todesdatum, den 23. February 167" (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 12).

<sup>55</sup> That is, the seventh year of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the fourth year of the Olympiad 236, and the year of Abraham 2183.

<sup>56</sup> The *Historia ecclesiastica* places the martyrdom between a mention of the accession of Marcus Aurelius (IV.15.1) and a reference to the eighth year of his reign, i.e., 167 (IV.19).

<sup>57</sup> Brind'Amour, "La date"; P. Nautin, "Polycarp."

<sup>58</sup> Turmel, *Lettre*, 23–33; Frend, "Note," 499–506.

<sup>59</sup> Waddington argued for February 23, 155 (W. H. Waddington, "Mémoire sur la chronologie de la vie du rhéteur Aelius Aristide," *Mémoires de l'Institut impérial de France* 26 (1867): 203–268). For a good summary of his position, see Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 270–271. Waddington's views were accepted by many, including E. Renan, *Der Antichrist* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1873), 207; Harnack, *Chronologie*, vol. 1, 334–356; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 646–722; idem, *Essays*, 103–104; C. J. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell), 355 n.3; P. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 2, 3rd ed. (New York: Scribner's, 1887), 665; Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 280; P. Corssen, "Die Vita Polycarpi," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 5 (1904): 266–302; E. Griffe, "Un nouvel article sur la date du martyre de saint Polycarpe," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 54 (1953): 178–181. Turner argued for February 22, 156 (C. H. Turner, "The Day and Year of St. Polycarp's Martyrdom," *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* 2 (1890), 105–155). He was followed by E. Schwartz, *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1905); idem, *De Pionio et Polycarpo* (Göttingen: Officina Academica Dieterichiana, 1905). Barnes favors 156 or 157 (Barnes, "Pre-Decian Acta Martyrium," 510–514; idem, "A Note on Polycarp," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 18 (1967): 433–437); and Dehandschutter arrives between 156 and 160 (Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi*, 273).

<sup>60</sup> Griffe, "Un nouvel article," 178–181.

Smyrna who was killed under the emperor Decius, c. A.D. 250. Although Frend refers to Eusebius' "conscientious" chronology, Barnes counters: "It has apparently escaped Frend's notice that in *HE* 4.15.47 Eusebius has misdated the martyrdom of Pionius by not less than eighty." In the *Chronicon*, Eusebius groups Polycarp's martyrdom itself with the outbreak of persecution in Lyons and Vienne, but most scholars now date that oppression to A.D. 176.

The primary positive evidence for this third school is a note attached at the end of the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (*Martyrdom* 21). This note states,

Now the blessed Polycarp was martyred on the second day of the first half of the month of Xanthicus, the seventh day before the kalends of March, a great sabbath, at the eighth hour. And he was arrested by Herod, when Philip of Tralles was High Priest, when Statius Quadratus was Pro-Consul, but Jesus Christ was reigning for ever, to whom be glory, honour, majesty and an eternal throne, from generation to generation, Amen (English translation in *LCL*).

Donaldson, however, believes that chapter 21 is an interpolation.<sup>61</sup> He contends that "a serious objection" to its authenticity is that "this of all chapters would have caught the eye of the historian and chronologist" Eusebius, but he makes no mention of it. Furthermore, "the particularity of the date is out of character with its being a contemporary writing." "Moreover we can scarcely conceive the people of Philomelium to have been ignorant who was proconsul during their own days." Donaldson concludes that the chapter was inserted after the Smyrnaeans began celebrating the day of Polycarp's martyrdom.<sup>62</sup> Grégoire and Orgels, Telfer, Marrou, and Campenhausen also reject this early date because they consider *Martyrdom* chapter 21 to be a late addition.<sup>63</sup> But Lightfoot argues that *Martyrdom* 21 was an original part of the letter.<sup>64</sup> Just as the opening of the *Martyrdom* imitates *1 Clement*, so this ending doxology resembles the closing doxology of that epistle. Yet Lightfoot's argument is hardly "decisive," as Salmon acknowledges.<sup>65</sup> In any case, even if this chapter is a later addition, it is not

---

<sup>61</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 214.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 215.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Grégoire and Orgels, "La véritable date," 11ff; Grégoire, *Les persécutions*, 106ff. Grégoire refers to the fact that Eusebius does not reproduce chap. 21; but he does not reproduce chap. 20 either, though it is undoubtedly genuine.

<sup>64</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1.2, 621–638.

<sup>65</sup> Salmon, "Polycarpus."

automatically false or unreliable.<sup>66</sup> Grégoire's contention that *Martyrdom* 21 was composed in the fourth or fifth century by randomly selecting names from extant inscriptions is "ein nicht zu beweisender Schluß und eine kühne, gelehrte Kombination."<sup>67</sup> Chapter 21 may have been appended early. Schwartz contends that the Philomelians added it before sending the letter on to others.<sup>68</sup> In my opinion, chapter 21 of the *Martyrdom*, although it may very well be an early addition, should carry more weight than Eusebius' chronology. Chapter 21 of the *Martyrdom* seems to be privy to contemporary details,<sup>69</sup> while Eusebius is obviously attempting to place the martyrdom in a general time frame. The specific information in the postscript supports this appraisal.<sup>70</sup>

Chapter 12.2 within the main body of the *Martyrdom* also refers to the same Philip. An Olympian description names Philip of Tralles as Asiarch in A.D. 149,<sup>71</sup> and four Trallian inscriptions from the reign of Antoninus Pius also designate Philip as the ἀρχιερεύς.<sup>72</sup> Another states that Philip was high priest of Asia in 149, 152/3 and in 155.<sup>73</sup> The office was normally held for four years, and it could be held more than once (and often was).<sup>74</sup> One concludes that the period of Philip's asiarchates centered at least in the late 40s and 50s of the second century.

<sup>66</sup> Barnes, "Note," 433 n.2; Reunig, *Zur Erklärung*, 3.

<sup>67</sup> Meinhold, "Polykarpos," 1678. Telfer finds a parallel by arguing that the *Life* knows of Bucolis only from his gravesite (Telfer, "Date," 81). But Bucolis was also extant in literary texts.

<sup>68</sup> Schwartz, *De Pionio et Polycarpo*, 33.

<sup>69</sup> I do not agree with the verdict of Telfer and Grégoire that Eusebius takes precedence, since it is a historical work, and the full text of the *Martyrdom* is only found in a stream of hagiographical tradition (Telfer, "Date," 80). The hagiographical tradition can, of course, incorporate an early source, and one cannot completely oppose the hagiographical and historical.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Meinhold: "Niemand wird den Mut haben, auf Grund eines Schreibfehlers von Euseb das bisherige Geschichtsbild umzustossen und an seiner Stelle ein neues auf einem so schwachen Fundament zu errichten" (Meinhold, "Polykarpos," 1680).

<sup>71</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 384. Lightfoot provides a good introduction to the office of Asiarch (ibid., 404–415). Strabo states that Asiarchs frequently came from the men of Tralles because of their wealth (see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 383–384). The asiarchate was often used for dating (ibid., 406).

<sup>72</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, I.1, 629. For the identity of the Asiarch as high priest, see idem, II.3, 407–411.

<sup>73</sup> Barnes, "Note," 437.

<sup>74</sup> Salmon, "Polycarpus"; Lightfoot refers to several instances of holding the office twice, and one case of three times (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 413–414).

The reference to Statius Quadratus may be even more helpful. Waddington demonstrated that Quadratus was *consul ordinarius* in A.D. 142. The normal interval between the offices of consulship and proconsulship ranged from twelve to sixteen years.<sup>75</sup> This would place Quadratus' proconsulship between 154 and 158. Lengthening the interval to twenty-five years to fit a proconsulship in 167 would be highly irregular. Waddington wished to narrow the field further, so he turned to the writings of Aelius Aristides. Waddington dated the proconsulship of Severus to 153–154, and then argued that Quadratus' ascension occurred the following year, because Aristides states, "Severus, I think, was proconsul the year before my companion." But although Quadratus was a rhetorician like Aristides, and although Quadratus had bestowed honors upon Aristides, we cannot establish that Aristides' "companion" is a certain reference to Quadratus.<sup>76</sup>

Ramsay bolstered Waddington's placement through the use of coins, and Meinhold strengthened the case by tracing the *Martyrdom of Polycarp's* place within the development of perspectives on martyrdom.<sup>77</sup> Salmon finds "more decisive" evidence in that February 23, 155 was a Saturday, and the *Martyrdom* refers to the date as a "great Sabbath."<sup>78</sup>

Many scholars immediately accepted Waddington's dating (i.e., Renan, Hilgenfeld, Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, and Randell).<sup>79</sup> Although Lightfoot appreciated and relied upon Waddington's investigation, he did not find February 23, 155 convincing. Instead, he turned to February 22, 156 (others who proposed

---

<sup>75</sup> In the Antonine age, there are no examples of a twelve year interval; a thirteen year interval is attested in several instances; fourteen years was common (Barnes, "Note," 436). Cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 277–278.

<sup>76</sup> Salmon, "Polycarpus."

<sup>77</sup> See W. M. Ramsay, "The Date of St. Polycarp's Martyrdom," *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 28 (1932), 245ff; Meinhold, "Polykarpos," 1680. Ramsay's further explanation that Eusebius confused Marcus' positions as tribune and caesar, with the result that the *Chronicon* places the martyrdom in the ninth year of his tribuneship (A.D. 155) stretches one's credulity. Why would Eusebius date the event based upon Marcus' tribuneship?

<sup>78</sup> But I have already noted above the debate surrounding the phrase "great Sabbath."

<sup>79</sup> See the related material earlier in this chapter. In 1893, Schmid published an early critique (Schmid, "Lebensgeschichte," 53–83). Harnack could find no objections to Schmid's criticisms, but arrived at 155 through some of the other evidence I have discussed (Harnack, *Chronologie*, vol. 1, 334–356).

156 included Lipsius, Schwartz, and Turner). The problem was reconciling this date with the *Martyrdom*'s statement that the death occurred on the seventh before the kalends of March. February 22, 156 was not the seventh before the kalends. Lightfoot was drawn to this date, once again, because February 22 was a Saturday. Similarly, Harrison wavered between February 23, 155 and February 22, 156.<sup>80</sup>

Salmon took another view. He theorized that Pionius (or whoever the author of *Martyrdom* 21 may have been) discovered a notice that Polycarp's martyrdom took place on the second of Xanthicus. Pionius took it for granted that this referred to the solar month of Xanthicus. In fact, the original reference was to the lunar, Macedonian month of Xanthicus.<sup>81</sup> Pionius therefore unwittingly stated the date as the seventh before the kalends of March. In reality, based upon a lunar calendar, Polycarp's martyrdom occurred on March 23, 155, not February 23. Salmon's footnote is noteworthy, however:

The solution offered above was proffered in the *Academy*, July 21, 1883, but Lightfoot, I.672, has since satisfactorily shewn that the lunar calendar had been superseded, at Smyrna, by the solar before the time of Polycarp. Nevertheless, I allow what has been printed above to stand, as presenting matter for consideration in the absence of any other admissible explanation of the "great sabbath."

Salmon's reckoning must also fit Polycarp's trip to Rome in the last year of his life and the first year of Anicetus' episcopacy.<sup>82</sup>

Let me add my own theory to the fray: Polycarp may have been martyred on February 23, 161. This date would (1) allow time (even more so) for the trip to Rome;<sup>83</sup> (2) it is within reason that Philip could still have been Asiarch in 161 (more so than in 167); (3) 161 would not overly stretch the normal range of Quadratus' promotion to proconsulship (again more so than 167); (4) February 23, 161 was a Sunday, and would explain the Jewish participation; (5) February 23 was the traditional feast day of Polycarp in the early Church; (6) the Christian observance of Sunday is one explanation of the term "great Sabbath";<sup>84</sup> (7)

---

<sup>80</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 281–283.

<sup>81</sup> Grégoire and Orgels agree that "Xanthicos" may refer to the Syrian-Macedonian calendar (and therefore April) (Grégoire and Orgels, "La véritable date," 12–13).

<sup>82</sup> Salmon, "Polycarpus."

<sup>83</sup> Anicetus did not come to the see until A.D. 155.

<sup>84</sup> Alternatively, his martyrdom could have been Saturday, February 23, 160. But this does not explain the active Jewish participation or the proximity to the accession of Marcus Aurelius.

February 23, 161 was the seventh before the kalends of March; (8) February 23, 161 was also the second of lunar Xanthicos; (9) the confusion with the reign of Marcus Aurelius is understandable, since he came to the throne two weeks later on March 7, 161. In the *Historia ecclesiastica*, Eusebius places the martyrdom right at this time of transition.<sup>85</sup>

I submit this possibility,<sup>86</sup> but in the final analysis, it seems best simply to leave the date between 155 and 167.<sup>87</sup> The statement of Lawlor and Oulton, expressed a century ago, still holds true: "the date of the martyrdom of Polycarp has been the subject of controversy for nearly three centuries, and it would be hazardous to say that the last word on the question has been spoken."<sup>88</sup>

At his martyrdom, Polycarp affirmed that he had served God for eighty-six years. Yet this statement is debated as well.<sup>89</sup> Blondell interpreted the eighty-six years as the duration of Polycarp's term as bishop, and Donaldson similarly believed that Polycarp had been in Christ's service for that duration.<sup>90</sup> This view has not been widely accepted. Most interpreters are divided between two opinions: those who equate the beginning of the eighty-six years with Polycarp's birth and those who equate it with his conversion or baptism. Salmon argues that

---

<sup>85</sup> Eusebius states, "Antoninus, called Pius, held the sovereignty for twenty-two years and was succeeded by Marcus Aurelius Verus, also called Antoninus, his son, together with his brother Lucius. At this time Polycarp was consecrated by martyrdom when great persecutions again disturbed Asia . . ." (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.14-15; English translation in *LCL*).

<sup>86</sup> The first seven of my points would also apply to February 23, 156. This date fits even better within the ranges of Quadratus' and Phillip's offices. But February 23, 156, was not the second of Xanthicos but the first, since it was a leap year, and 156 lies five years away from the reign of Marcus Aurelius. A. P. Orbán has defended this date in "Martyrium Polycarpi," in *Atti e Passioni dei Martiri*, ed. A. A. R. Bastiaensen (Milan: Lorenzo Valla, 1987), n.34. Harrison argues that the seventh of kalends in 156 would have landed on Monday, February 24, due to the leap year (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 273). Here he is clearly in error; he may have read a modern practice into the ancient calendar. The Romans did not add an extra day at the end of February (unlike the modern conception of February 29). The Romans added an extra day between February 23 and 24. They created two days which were "the sixth before the kalends of March." Therefore, they labeled leap years as "bi-sextile" years.

<sup>87</sup> In any case, the use of the *Martyrdom* seems to place the *terminus ante quem* before 177 (Dehandschutter, "Martyrium Polycarpi," 501-502).

<sup>88</sup> See Telfer, "Date," 83.

<sup>89</sup> Irenaeus does not help since he merely mentions that Polycarp "departed this life at a very great age" (*Adversus haereses* III.3).

<sup>90</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 223.

the eighty-six years must “clearly” begin with Polycarp’s baptism,<sup>91</sup> while Lightfoot finds the former option to be “the more probable supposition”<sup>92</sup> and “the more natural interpretation.”<sup>93</sup> Polycarp visited Rome around A.D. 155, and Lightfoot finds such a trip to be possible for a man in his mid eighties, “but we could not add even a few years to his age without transgressing the bounds of probability.”<sup>94</sup> In this sense, Polycarp’s affirmation could be loosely equated with, “I have served God my entire life.”<sup>95</sup> If then we subtract eighty-six years from A.D. 161 (based upon this dating of his martyrdom), we are left with A.D. 75, and Polycarp would have been born right about this time. Of course, a baptism early in life would not add much time to the equation.<sup>96</sup> If one follows the (seemingly incredible) “Harris Fragments,” Polycarp died at the age of one hundred and four; and this would place his baptism at the age of eighteen.<sup>97</sup>

### The Life of Polycarp

Besides the *Martyrdom*, a third, fourth, or fifth century *Life of Polycarp* survives.<sup>98</sup> Corssen, Schwartz, Streeter, and Cadoux have defended the general

---

<sup>91</sup> Salmon, “Polycarpus.”

<sup>92</sup> Lightfoot, *Essays*, 90.

<sup>93</sup> Idem, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 437.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 438.

<sup>95</sup> See Pierre Nautin, *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des I<sup>er</sup> et II<sup>es</sup> siècles* (Paris: Cerf, 1961), 72 n.1. Bauer compares the construction with Luke 2:36–37 (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 11).

<sup>96</sup> Telfer, “Date,” 82–83. Camelot allows for the close relationship between his birth and baptism, “il aurait donc été baptisé, sinon dès sa naissance, du moins dans son enfance” (Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 188).

<sup>97</sup> “Harris Fragments” 64r + 56v. (See Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*, 25, 44).

<sup>98</sup> For an English translation, see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 488–506. The *Life* must be third century at the earliest, since it uses Irenaeus’ material (Dehandschutter, “The Martyrium Polycarpi,” 491–492). Lightfoot dates the work to the late fourth century (Lightfoot, *Essays*, II.3, 429–431). Lightfoot agrees that a Pionius wrote both the *Life* and the postscript to the *Martyrdom*, but he argues that this Pionius differs from the third century martyr (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 426–427). Schoedel and Dehandschutter side with the fourth century as well (Schoedel, “Polycarp of Smyrna,” 350; Dehandschutter, “Martyrium Polycarpi,” 488–489); Schmidt also argues for a late fourth century date (C. Schmidt, ed., *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1919), 723–725); Delehayé contends for the early fifth century (H. Delehayé, *Sanctus* (Brussels: Société de bollandistes, 1927) 27, 49 n.1, 54, 59). Naturally, if

historical reliability of the *Life*.<sup>99</sup> Cadoux finds the work to be “in the main worthy of trust” and believes that “no sufficient reason” exists to doubt that it was written by Pionius, who was martyred in Smyrna in A.D. 250.<sup>100</sup> Cadoux (following Corssen) further contends that Pionius wished to collect a sort of *Corpus Polycarpianum*, which would have included the *Life of Polycarp*, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, Polycarp’s *Epistle to the Philippians*, and a list of Smyrnaean church leaders.<sup>101</sup>

But most consider the *Life* to be almost entirely unhistorical.<sup>102</sup> The account contains many hagiographical embellishments and various anachronisms. As Lightfoot comments, “If it contains any grains of truth, we have no means of sifting them from the huge heap of falsehood.”<sup>103</sup> Furthermore, the work betrays definite anti-Quartodeciman tendencies.<sup>104</sup> Based upon the Jewish calendar, the Asian Quartodecimans celebrated the Passion on the fourteenth of Nisan, regardless of the day of the week. They claimed that this heritage went back to John the Apostle. The *Life* contends that the Apostle Paul had visited Smyrna, and that he had never instructed the Smyrnaeans to celebrate the Passion on the fourteenth of Nisan (*Life* 2).

---

one assumes that the famous martyr named “Pionius” is the author of the *Life*, then the work is dated in the mid third century (Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 306–310; Corssen, “Die Vita Polycarpi,” 266–302).

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.; Schwartz, *De Pionio et Polycarpo*, 24–32; B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (London: Macmillan, 1929), 94, 164–171; 263–278; Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 306–310. Bihlmeyer characterized this attempt as “einen starken Fehlgriff der philologischen Kritik” (*Die Apostolischen Väter*, xli); Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 18, flirts with the *Life*’s historicity.

<sup>100</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 307, 310.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 307; Schoedel, “Polycarp of Smyrna,” 350. Dehandschutter opposes the idea of a *Corpus Polycarpianum* (Dehandschutter, “Martyrium Polycarpi,” 491). See also Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*, 6–7.

<sup>102</sup> Schmidt has written a lengthy criticism of the *Life* (Schmidt, *Gespräche*, 705–725). Quasten considers the work to be “purely legendary in character” (J. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 1: *The Beginnings of Patristic Literature* (Westminster: Newman, 1949), 79); cf. Glimm: “altogether legendary” (F. X. Glimm, “The Letter of St. Polycarp to the Philippians,” in *The Apostolic Fathers*, trans. F. X. Glimm, J. M.-F. Marique, and G. G. Walsh (New York: Cima, 1947), 131); Salmon: “completely unhistorical” (Salmon, “Polycarpus”); Andrews: “worthless” (Andrews, “Polycarp”); Camelot: “un ouvrage d’imagination, sans valeur historique” (Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 185).

<sup>103</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 435–436.

<sup>104</sup> Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1681.



The *Life* narrates how the wealthy Christian widow Callisto of Smyrna was instructed by an angel to purchase Polycarp, a slave boy of Eastern birth. A while later, Callisto went on a trip and left Polycarp as household steward. While she was gone, he distributed all her goods to the poor. Upon her return, Callisto grew angry at the news of the loss of her wealth (she was still unaware of the charitable distribution). A vexed Polycarp prayed for assistance, and God replenished the storehouses.

Over time, the bishop of Smyrna, Bucolis, grew fond of Polycarp and ordained him as deacon. After Polycarp's further maturation, Bucolis ordained him presbyter. While lying on his deathbed, Bucolis took hold of Polycarp's hand and pressed it to his own chest and face, symbolizing the committal of graces. After the burial, the neighboring bishops gathered in the church of Smyrna, along with a large crowd. Certain members of the throng reported visions signifying Polycarp as the rightful heir to the bishopric, and when the deacons asked the people who they would have, they unanimously shouted, "Let Polycarp be our shepherd and teacher." He was subsequently installed as bishop of Smyrna. As a church leader, Polycarp wrote many treatises, discourses, and letters, and he performed many astounding miracles. The *Life* portrays Polycarp's teaching as stressing sexual discipline and glorifying virginity; it describes his miracles in a manner reminiscent of Elijah and Elisha.

The claims of Lightfoot that the *Life* may be correct in its warrant that Polycarp was a slave from the East and in its affirmation that Polycarp may have come into some wealth are possible but coincidental.<sup>105</sup> Lightfoot points to the supporting facts that "Polycarp" was a common Roman slave name and that the *Martyrdom* describes him as owning a sizeable rural farm. Indeed, "Polycarp" was a common Roman slave name,<sup>106</sup> but that may be the very reason the *Life* considered him to be so centuries later. And the origin of Polycarp's wealth in the *Life* (through the benefaction of a rich Christian widow) remains unsubstantiated. It seems that no historical weight should be placed upon the *Life* in a reconstruction of the life of Polycarp. The work is too late and too imaginative.

---

<sup>105</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 436, 439.

<sup>106</sup> Much like Carpus, Carpophorus, Eucarpus, Fructus, Fructuosus, Onesimus, Onesiphorus, Pancarpus, etc. For a brief summary of the presence of the name "Polycarp" in inscriptions, see Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 7.

## Evidence from Irenaeus

Although the *Life* is problematic in reconstructing the historical Polycarp, Irenaeus' references are more helpful. Some kind of personal relationship between Irenaeus and Polycarp is relatively undoubted.<sup>107</sup> Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, had been reared in Asia Minor, perhaps even in Smyrna. Irenaeus himself mentions his childhood interaction with Polycarp.<sup>108</sup> Irenaeus later provided three important clusters of evidence.<sup>109</sup> First, Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* III.3 (written sometime after 180) includes this intriguing material:<sup>110</sup>

But Polycarp also was not only instructed by apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also, by apostles in Asia, appointed bishop of the Church in Smyrna, whom I also saw in my early youth, for he tarried <on earth> a very long time, and, when a very old man, gloriously and most nobly suffering martyrdom, departed this life, having always taught the things which he had learned from the apostles, and which the Church has handed down, and which alone are true. To these things all the Asiatic Churches testify as do also those men who have succeeded Polycarp down to the present time, – a man who was of much greater weight, and a more steadfast witness of truth, than Valentinus, and Marcion, and the rest of the heretics. He it was who, coming to Rome in the time of Anicetus caused many to turn away from the aforesaid heretics to the Church of God, proclaiming that he had received this one and sole truth from the apostles, – that, namely, which is handed down by the Church. There are also those who heard from him that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed out of the bath-house without bathing, exclaiming, “Let us fly, lest even the bath-house fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within.” And Polycarp himself replied to Marcion, who met him on one occasion, and said, “Dost thou know me?” “I do know thee, the first-born of Satan.” Such was the horror which the apostles and their disciples had against holding even verbal communication with any corrupters of the truth; as Paul also says, “A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself.” There is also a very powerful Epistle of Polycarp written to the Philippians, from which those who choose to do so, and are anxious about their salvation, can learn the character of his faith, and the preaching of the truth. Then, again, the Church in Ephesus, founded by

---

<sup>107</sup> The further supposition that Polycarp sent missionaries to Gaul (Burton, Introduction, 50) is unsubstantiated.

<sup>108</sup> Lightfoot dates this period of interaction between 135 and 150 (Lightfoot, *Essays*, 97).

<sup>109</sup> Later authors, such as Eusebius and Jerome, merely build upon Irenaeus' information.

<sup>110</sup> Also conserved by Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.14.

Paul, and having John remaining among them permanently until the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the apostles (English translation in *ANF*).<sup>111</sup>

Was Polycarp installed as bishop by one or more of the Apostles? Irenaeus' motivation of trying to establish apostolic succession in bishoprics and apostolic tradition in doctrine is self-evident,<sup>112</sup> and his contention that Polycarp was installed by the Apostles has been understandably questioned. One also recalls that the later *Life of Polycarp* makes no mention of the role of Apostles in the appointment of Polycarp as bishop.<sup>113</sup> In addition, we are faced with a chronological difficulty, for "we are startled either at the great age of the man, or at the possibility of his having intercourse with the apostles."<sup>114</sup> Schoedel makes several other observations: Polycarp himself does not appeal to any connection with the disciples or claim to have been appointed by them. Neither Ignatius nor Polycarp make cause of apostolic succession, nor do they cite the authority of John in combating docetism.<sup>115</sup> In any case the Irenaeus passage should not be used to argue that Polycarp was appointed bishop by apostles (plural), nor that he was made bishop of all of Asia.<sup>116</sup>

The whole matter might be easily dismissed except for a second extract, one of Irenaeus' letters contained in Eusebius (*Historia ecclesiastica* V.20). This

---

<sup>111</sup> The Mosquensis Epilogue of the *Martyrdom* is clearly dependent on this Irenaeus material (Dehandschutter, "Martyrium Polycarpi," 491–492).

<sup>112</sup> "On comprends qu'Irénée, si soucieux d'affirmer en face des fantasmes gnostiques la tradition de l'Église, se soit référé à Polycarpe comme à un témoin privilégié de la tradition apostolique" (Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 190).

<sup>113</sup> Though this is understandable, since the *Life* was an anti-Quartodeciman interpretation of Polycarp's career. The Quartodecimans (such as Polycrates) appealed to the authority of John. The *Life* also refrains from referring to Polycarp's trip to Rome to straighten out the Easter problem (see Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 309). The *Life* has the Apostle Paul place Stratias at Smyrna. The *Life* might also refrain from mentioning the Johannine tradition due to the intense rivalry between Smyrna and Ephesus. "To insist that Polycarp was disciple of John might appear to subordinate Smyrna to Ephesus" (Telfer, "Date," 80 n.4; see also Grégoire and Orgels, "La véritable date," 10). See also Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*, 141–147.

<sup>114</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 223; cf. Streeter, *Primitive Christianity*, 93–96. The "Harris Fragments" state that Polycarp died at the age of one hundred and four (See Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*, 25, 44).

<sup>115</sup> W. R. Schoedel, "Polycarp, Epistle of," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

<sup>116</sup> Batiffol, "Polycarp."

letter is addressed to Florinus, a former companion of Irenaeus who had fallen into several heresies.<sup>117</sup> In order to rebuke his former comrade, Irenaeus refers to their shared experiences:

These opinions, O Florinus, that I may speak sparingly, do not belong to sound doctrine. These opinions are inconsistent with the church, and bring those who believe in them into the greatest impiety. These opinions not even the heretics outside the church ever dared to proclaim. These opinions those who were presbyters before us, they who accompanied the apostles, did not hand on to you. For while I was still a boy I knew you in lower Asia in Polycarp's house when you were a man of rank in the royal hall and endeavoring to stand well with him. I remember the events of those days more clearly than those which happened recently, for what we learn as children grows up with the soul and is united to it, so that I can speak even of the place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and disputed, how he came in and went out, the character of his life, the appearance of his body, the discourses which he made to the people, how he reported his intercourse with John and with the others who had seen the Lord, how he remembered their words, and what were the things concerning the Lord which he had heard from them, and about their miracles, and about their teaching, and how Polycarp had received them from the eyewitnesses of the word of life, and reported all things in agreement with the Scriptures. I listened eagerly even then to these things through the mercy of God which was given me, and made notes of them, not on paper but in my heart, and ever by the grace of God do I truly ruminate on them, and I can bear witness before God that if that blessed and apostolic presbyter had heard anything of this kind he would have cried out, and shut his ears, and said according to his custom, "O good God, to what time hast thou preserved me that I should endure this?" He would have fled even from the place in which he was seated or standing when he heard such words. And from his letters which he sent either to the neighboring churches, strengthening them, or to some of the brethren, exhorting and warning them, this can be made plain (English translation in *LCL*).

In this passage addressed to his former companion Florinus, Irenaeus recalls his childhood experiences of the two of them listening to the words of Polycarp in the "royal court."<sup>118</sup> Harnack attempted to disassemble the John-Polycarp-Irenaeus chain at both ends. First, he argued that Irenaeus was only a boy (παῖς) at the

---

<sup>117</sup> Early on, Lightfoot considered this to be one of the earliest writings of Irenaeus (Lightfoot, *Essays*, 99); but the letter may be placed c. 189/190 at the earliest (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 17). The further hypothesis that the entirety of Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* was written with Florinus in mind (Burton, Introduction, 50) lacks evidence and does not account for the variety within the work.

<sup>118</sup> For some views of this court, see Lightfoot, *Essays*, 98; cf. also Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 353 n.1.

time; therefore his recollections carry little weight. Second, Harnack argued that John the apostle has been confused with John the presbyter.<sup>119</sup>

Yet several observations may be made. First, although *παῖς* does not always refer to someone under the age of thirteen,<sup>120</sup> it usually does refer to a younger child; and this remains the stronger possibility. Second, however, Irenaeus stresses the certainty of his childhood memories. He remembers “the events of those days more clearly than those which happened recently.” The lessons of childhood, “growing up with the soul,” become identified with it. He remembers details of the very place, of Polycarp’s actions and appearance, and of Polycarp’s teachings. He has noted them down in his heart and ruminates upon them constantly and faithfully. He gives an example of one of Polycarp’s peculiar phrases: “O good God, to what time hast thou preserved me that I should endure this?” Either Irenaeus is lying, greatly mistaken, or telling the truth.<sup>121</sup> Third, these are events purportedly experienced first-hand by both Irenaeus and Florinus. Admittedly, the “real” audience was much wider than the designated addressee Florinus. Nevertheless, it would seem strange for Irenaeus to refute Florinus using recollections they both knew were blatantly false.<sup>122</sup> Fourth, contra Schoedel and Culpepper,<sup>123</sup> one may not assume that Polycarp would have automatically referred to his connection with the first generation Christians in the argumentation of the short, occasional *Phil*. These considerations seem to make more credible Irenaeus’ claim that Polycarp was acquainted with “John and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord.”

However, one is not necessarily allowed to jump hastily to the conclusion that this “John” is the son of Zebedee, one of the twelve Apostles. Tertullian refers to John “the Apostle” as installing Polycarp as bishop (*De praescriptione haereticorum* 32.2), as does Jerome (*De viris illustribus* 17). Yet Irenaeus refers

---

<sup>119</sup> Harnack, *Chronologie*, vol. 1, 320ff.

<sup>120</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 448. When *παῖς* is not used in the sense of age (child), it is sometimes used in the sense of status (slave, servant). See *LSJ*, “*παῖς*.” But Lightfoot finds examples of *παῖς* used of non-slave young adults.

<sup>121</sup> R. A. Culpepper, *John the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1994), 123–128. See also Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*, 126–133, who argues for the possibility of confused “corporate memories.”

<sup>122</sup> See Culpepper, *John*, 126.

<sup>123</sup> Schoedel, “Polycarp, Epistle of.” Culpepper, *John*, 127.

to John “the disciple of the Lord.” Irenaeus elsewhere refers to Papias as “the scholar of John and companion to Polycarp” (*Historia ecclesiastica* III.39.1). Eusebius criticizes Irenaeus on this point and accuses him of confusion. Based upon the language of Papias himself, Eusebius argues that Papias’ master was not John the Apostle, but the “Elder” of the same name (*Historia ecclesiastica* III.39). On the other hand, Eusebius’ conclusion may have been affected by his anti-chiliastic bent.<sup>124</sup> In the end, we cannot rule out *a priori* that Polycarp was acquainted with the Apostle John,<sup>125</sup> although it may remain impossible to disprove that Polycarp is referring to a different “John the Elder” or some other “disciple of the Lord” by that name.<sup>126</sup> Admittedly, the *Life of Polycarp* does not mention this connection with John. However, the late *Life* may omit the relationship with John because of its anti-Quartodeciman perspective.<sup>127</sup>

A balanced approach would seem to keep several things in mind. First, Tertullian, Eusebius, and Jerome altered Irenaeus’ statement of John “the disciple

---

<sup>124</sup> The mid-second century apocryphal *Acts of John* places the Apostle John in Ephesus and refers to requests that he visit Smyrna; Clement of Alexandria refers to John’s founding the episcopate in Asia Minor (Clement of Alexandria, *Qui dives salvetur* 42). See also the *Muratorian Canon* 10 and Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem* IV.5.2. Recent analyses of the *Muratorian Canon* have wavered in its dating, placing it either in the late second century (Henne, agreeing with Ferguson against Sundberg) or in the fourth century (Hahneman). See A. C. Sundberg, “Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List,” *Harvard Theological Review* 66 (1973): 1–41; E. Ferguson, “Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance,” *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982): 677–683; G. F. Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); P. Henne, “La datation du Canon de Muratori,” *Revue biblique* 100 (1993): 54–75. See also the following unfavorable critiques of Hahneman: E. Ferguson, Review of *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*, by G. M. Hahneman, in *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 44 (1993): 696; C. E. Hill, “The Debate over the Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 57 (1995): 437–452.

<sup>125</sup> Glimm, “Letter,” 131.

<sup>126</sup> Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 280; Nautin, “Polycarp”; A. H. McNeile, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, 2nd rev. ed. Rev. by C. S. C. Williams (Oxford: Oxford University, 1953), 282–284. See also the summary in Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*, 127–129. Obviously, the terms “apostle” and “disciple” can be used of the same individual.

<sup>127</sup> Polycrates of Ephesus, in a letter to Victor of Rome (c. A.D. 190), stresses that Polycarp had preserved the Quartodeciman practice from the time of the Apostle John (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.24.2–7). The “Harris Fragments” stress a relationship between John and Polycarp (Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*).

of the Lord” to explicitly name John as “the apostle.”<sup>128</sup> Second, if John the Apostle and John the Elder are in fact two different individuals, we should probably still conclude that the latter was an eyewitness of Jesus’ ministry as well.<sup>129</sup> This much seems clear from Irenaeus’ statements (cf. Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III.36).<sup>130</sup> Third, the possibility of personal interaction with an apostle or eyewitness at a young age must be distinguished from a formal notion of apostolic succession in which the apostle actually places the younger individual in office.<sup>131</sup> As Salmon avers, “The known fact that he had been a hearer of St. John would under any circumstances be likely to receive the addition that he had been made bishop by John.”<sup>132</sup> Polycarp himself only referred to his interaction as a child with John (*Epistle to Florinus* in Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.20). The *Martyrdom* simply states that he was an “apostolic and prophetic teacher” (16.2).<sup>133</sup> While Irenaeus refers to his apostolic ordination in general (*Adversus haereses* III.3), Tertullian relates the Smyrnaean church’s claim that the Apostle John appointed Polycarp (*De praescriptione haereticorum* 32.1–2).<sup>134</sup> The

---

<sup>128</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 195. Irenaeus generically states elsewhere that Polycarp had been “instructed by apostles” and “was appointed bishop by apostles” (cf. *Martyrdom* 16.2).

<sup>129</sup> M. Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (London: SCM, 1989), 102–108. Idem., *Die johanische Frage* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993). R. Bauckham, “Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel,” *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 44 (1993): 24–69.

<sup>130</sup> See also Telfer, “Date,” 82–83, who argues that Polycarp may have known “apostles” who had personally known Jesus, but not necessarily any John.

<sup>131</sup> The *Life* narrates that Bucolis preceded Polycarp as bishop. Several late authorities claim that John the Apostle appointed Bucolis as bishop and then gave him Polycarp as an assistant (F. Weidmann, “Intertextuality and Intent: John and the Apostolic Mission in the Harris Fragments on Polycarp,” *Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 396).

<sup>132</sup> Salmon, “Polycarpus.” Cf. Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1671. Foster argues, “Whatever St. John’s part in the making of this Bishop, is it not possible that St. John gave him his episcopal name?” He goes on to argue that John took Polycarp’s name from his own Gospel of John 15:5–8, where Jesus speaks of bearing “much fruit.” This whole contention seems highly imaginative (J. Foster, “Note on St. Polycarp,” *Expository Times* 77 (1966): 319).

<sup>133</sup> Weidmann considers it “worthy of note that nowhere in the text of the familiar *Martyrdom of Polycarp* is a relationship with John mentioned (Weidmann, “Intertextuality,” 394–398). Weidmann is certainly correct in suggesting that the use of the c. seventh century “Harris Fragments” on Polycarp to prove a historical relationship with John is futile.

<sup>134</sup> Meinhold believes that the Smyrnaean church created this apostolic ordination to be comparable with Rome (Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1671).

“Harris Fragments” recount that Polycarp was a disciple of John, who had made him bishop of Smyrna.<sup>135</sup> Eusebius avers that Polycarp was “an intimate disciple of the apostles” (*Historia ecclesiastica* III.36),<sup>136</sup> and Jerome states that Polycarp was a disciple of several apostles and was ordained by John (*De viris illustribus* 17). When these sources are chronologically arranged, one notices a development toward a closer connection between John and Polycarp which stresses episcopal ordination and apostolic succession (including the role of more than one apostle). Polycarp may have had a few stories of a (brief?) childhood connection with John, and Irenaeus, for his part, may have remembered only little of the material.<sup>137</sup> Over a period of time, the retelling of the association may have grown into apostolic ordination.<sup>138</sup> Fourth, one must remember the looseness of the terms “bishop” and “elder” at this stage of ecclesiastical development. One could be installed as a “bishop” in the sense of elder without being installed as a monarchical bishop.<sup>139</sup>

### Encounters with Anicetus, Marcion, and Ignatius

The third extract from Irenaeus concerns the visit of Polycarp to Anicetus in Rome. Many date this conference in A.D. 155.<sup>140</sup> This information is more

---

<sup>135</sup> Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*, 22, 43.

<sup>136</sup> Eusebius also states that Ignatius designated Polycarp as “an apostolical man and as a good and faithful shepherd,” though the term “apostolical” is not found in the *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans* or the *Epistle to Polycarp* (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III.36).

<sup>137</sup> In this regard, it may be significant that Polycarp relayed John’s encounter with Cerinthus as derived from others (Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III.3.4; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.14.6; cf. Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 391; Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 194–195).

<sup>138</sup> The *Life of Polycarp*, Suidas, and the *Apostolic Constitutions* do not refer to Polycarp’s apostolic ordination at all. The *Apostolic Constitutions* do not even mention Polycarp in the episcopal line of Smyrna. Some of these omissions of John may be due to anti-Quartodeciman purposes or perhaps a Smyrnaean rivalry with Ephesus (Weidmann, “Intertextuality,” 398; idem, *Polycarp and John*, 141–147). The *Acts of John* do refer to John’s appointment of Polycarp.

<sup>139</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 322.

<sup>140</sup> Anicetus was the bishop of Rome, A.D. 155–166; Lipsius placed his rise between 154 and 156 (R. A. Lipsius, *Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe bis zur Mitte des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Kiel: Schwer, 1869), 263); for those who place Polycarp’s martyrdom in 166/167, it is naturally feasible to place the Anicetus’ visit later as well. Burton situates it in 158 (Introduction, 32).



acceptable to modern historians. Irenaeus mentions it briefly in *Adversus haereses* III.3, but Eusebius provides a more detailed letter of Irenaeus (*Historia ecclesiastica* V.24) which also refers to the visit. Irenaeus wrote the letter to Victor, bishop of Rome. Victor had excommunicated the Asiatic Churches because of their “Quartodeciman” observance. Irenaeus, a bishop of Eastern origin living in the West, censured Victor for his lack of latitude. As a historical precedent, Irenaeus referred to the visit of Polycarp to Anicetus.

In the traditional interpretation of this passage, Polycarp and Anicetus discussed several issues, but the primary purpose of the trip was a discussion of the Paschal Festival’s celebration of the institution of the Eucharist and commemoration of the Passion.<sup>141</sup> Even if the original purpose of the visit lay elsewhere, the Paschal celebration certainly became a topic of discussion.<sup>142</sup> In all likelihood, Anicetus was not trying to intervene in Asia Minor; rather, he wanted to establish a uniform practice in Rome, even among recent immigrants from Asia Minor. Polycarp would have been summoned as an able defender of the practice of these Eastern immigrants.<sup>143</sup> Polycarp maintained that the Asiatic observance was based upon apostolic practices (especially Johannine). On the other hand, Anicetus maintained that his predecessors had celebrated the Passion on Friday and the Resurrection on Sunday. Neither changed the other’s mind, but they parted as friends, and Anicetus allowed Polycarp to celebrate the Eucharist in his place.<sup>144</sup> Irenaeus’ further statement that Polycarp converted many

---

<sup>141</sup> Donaldson believes that this traditional interpretation is a misunderstanding of Irenaeus’ material. Donaldson points out that Irenaeus does not assign any reason for the visit of Polycarp to Rome (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 196; cf. Salmon, “Polycarpus”). He merely begins, “while Polycarp was sojourning in Rome.” Donaldson further argues that the Roman Church apparently had no peculiar festival or fast at Passover (ibid., 197). In the end, “We cannot say with certainty what kind of Easter observance was used at Rome in the time of Anicetus, for the language of Irenaeus implies that it was not then what it afterwards became” (Salmon, “Polycarpus”).

<sup>142</sup> Campenhausen asserts that the debate surrounded the celebration of the Easter fast, not the date of Easter (H. F. von Campenhausen, “Ostertermin oder Osterfasten? Zum Verständnis des Irenäusbriefs an Viktor (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 5,24,12–17),” *Vigiliae Christianae* 28 (1974): 114–138).

<sup>143</sup> Norris, “Ignatius,” 23–44. Cf. Polycrates’ later defense of the Asia Minor dating (using the authority of Polycarp) in Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.24.2–7.

<sup>144</sup> This seems to be “the most probable meaning” of παρεχώρησεν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν (Lightfoot, *Essays*, 100; cf. Salmon, “Polycarpus”); Meinhold argues that Polycarp was allowed

Valentinians and Marcionites (*Adversus haereses* III.3.4) may be an example of an exaggerated triumphalism.<sup>145</sup>

Finally, our sources mention Polycarp's interactions with Ignatius and Marcion. Eusebius describes Polycarp's relationship with Ignatius in *Historia ecclesiastica* III.36.<sup>146</sup> Few scholars would doubt that Ignatius, while traveling through Asia Minor on his way to Rome, came into contact with Polycarp. I will save a discussion of this series of events for the following chapter. Irenaeus also mentions an encounter between Polycarp and Marcion, and I will investigate this alleged event more fully in chapter 6.

Ignatius' epistles only help us reconstruct a few months of Polycarp's life, but they may also help us describe the personality of Polycarp. Ignatius refers to Polycarp's "godly mind which is fixed as if on immovable rock," his "blameless face," and his "fervour for the truth" (*Epistle to Polycarp* 1.1, 7.3; English translations in *LCL*). In his *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans*, Ignatius refers to Polycarp as their "godly bishop" (12.2). Yet he also exhorts Polycarp to "be more diligent than you are," "Entreat for more wisdom than you have," "Let the meetings be more numerous" (*Epistle to Polycarp* 3.2; 1.2; 4.2; English translations in *LCL*).<sup>147</sup> Admittedly, such rhetorical descriptions and pleas may not fully reflect Polycarp's actual personality.<sup>148</sup>

---

to celebrate the Paschal Eucharist according to the Asia Minor custom ("Polykarpos," 1669).

<sup>145</sup> Ibid.; Cf. W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, 2nd ed., trans. Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins and ed. R. A. Kraft and G. Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 129.

<sup>146</sup> Eusebius groups Polycarp, Papias, and Ignatius together (*Historia ecclesiastica* III.36).

<sup>147</sup> English translations in *LCL*.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. Ignatius' similar descriptions of the Smyrnaeans and Polycarp (*Epistle to the Smyrnaeans* 1.1 and *Epistle to Polycarp* 1.1)

## Chapter 3

### Smyrna, Philippi, and Their Churches

I move now to the geographical settings involved in the sender and recipients of *Phil*: the cities of Smyrna and Philippi. In addition, I will investigate the Smyrnaean and Philippian churches, including their histories and organization. Finally, I will discuss Ignatius' journey, an event which involved both the Smyrnaean and Philippian congregations.

#### The City of Smyrna

Polycarp's hometown of Smyrna (modern Izmir) lies on the south shore of the gulf of Smyrna, at the mouth of the Meles river, and at the foot of Mt. Pagros. Pottery indicates that Aeolian Greeks founded "Old Smyrna" on the north/northeastern shore of the gulf by the 10th century B.C. By the end of the 8th century, Ionian Greeks, who had settled to the south, had gained control. Herodotus relates that while the Aeolians were outside their walls celebrating a festival of Dionysius, Ionian exiles from Clazomenai, who had originally been welcomed, seized the whole city. According to local tradition, Homer was a Smyrnaean native, though this claim was disputed by other cities (including Chios).

During the 7th cent. B.C., Smyrna resisted the emerging kingdom of Lydia, but King Alyattes captured Smyrna around 600 B.C.<sup>1</sup> Strabo relates that all the inhabitants were forced out and scattered into the surrounding region, though archaeology does not wholly substantiate this claim.<sup>2</sup> The Persians took the city c. 545 B.C. and destroyed the temple of Athena.

---

<sup>1</sup> R. V. Nicholls, "Old Smyrna: Its Iron Age Fortifications and Associated Remains on the City Perimeter," *Annual of the British School at Athens* 53/54 (1958/1959): 88–91, 128–134; J. M. Cook, "Old Smyrna: 1948–1951," *Annual of the British School at Athens* 53/54 (1958/1959): 23–27.

<sup>2</sup> M. Grant, *A Guide to the Ancient World: A Dictionary of Classical Place Names* (Bronx: Wilson, 1986), s.v. "Smyrna."

According to tradition, when Alexander the Great invaded the city in 334 B.C., he was inspired by a dream to rebuild the city on the south shore of the gulf of Smyrna. But Cadoux maintains that construction does not seem to have begun until Lysimachus took up the project around 287 B.C.<sup>3</sup> He built the Acropolis on top of Mt. Pagros and constructed walls that ran down to the harbor. He also renamed the city Eurydiceia, in honor of his daughter; but the name did not last, since the Seleucids conquered Smyrna in 281.

In 197 B.C., Smyrna appealed to Rome for help against the Seleucid king Antiochus III. Openly defying Antiochus, the Smyrnaeans erected a temple to the goddess Roma in 195. Because of its alliance, Rome made Smyrna a free city after the Roman defeat of Antiochus in 189. Smyrna retained this status until Rome reduced it to a tributary city because it assisted Mithridates during the First Mithridaean War (89–85 B.C.).

The next half century severely tried Smyrna. Mithridates re-invaded the area in 73 B.C. Roman leaders demanded vast amounts of money from western Asia Minor during the civil wars from 49–30 B.C. The Parthians briefly occupied Smyrna from 41–39 B.C.

Following these times of unrest, Smyrna began to rebuild and flourish. The city prospered from the production and export of clothing, perfumes, wine, and other goods. Strabo described Smyrna as “the most beautiful city of all” (Strabo, *Geographica* XIV.1.37).<sup>4</sup> The city included wonderful examples of splendid architecture. A theater, stadium, gymnasium, and impressive agora have all been discovered.<sup>5</sup> Two principle streets, the Sacred Way and the Golden Road, ran from west to east, so that the sea breeze cooled the town.

Smyrna became one of the four centers of the provincial assembly (along with Ephesus, Sardis, and Pergamum).<sup>6</sup> It was ruled by its own βουλή composed of its

<sup>3</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 99–100.

<sup>4</sup> Smyrna’s beauty (especially architectural beauty) is a common theme in ancient sources (see C. J. Hemer, *The Letters of the Seven Churches of Asia in Their Local Setting* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1986), 59–60).

<sup>5</sup> The *Life of Polycarp* refers to Smyrna’s beautiful Ephesian Royal Gate (*Life* 20).

<sup>6</sup> Magie supposes that the population of Smyrna would have rivaled that of Ephesus (D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1950), 146).

richest citizens. Important officials included the γραμματεὺς (secretary), ταμίης (treasurer), ἀγρόνομος (market inspector), and εἰρηναρχός (police chief).

The glory of Smyrna in the 2nd cent. A.D. is well-documented due to the works of Philostratus and Aelius Aristides. Philostratus was especially interested in the ostentatious M. Antonius Polemo, a professional orator and physiognomist who took up residence in Smyrna. People said that he spoke to cities as inferiors, emperors as not his superiors, and gods as his equals (Philostratus, *Vitae Sophistarum* 535). Aelius Aristides, a local politician, wrote an autobiography which he entitled *The Sacred Tales*. The work describes Aelius' various illnesses,<sup>7</sup> and the many ways in which he weaseled out of public posts.<sup>8</sup>

Smyrna was a center for the imperial and provincial cults. The Smyrnaeans built a temple to the goddess Roma as early as 195 B.C.<sup>9</sup> During the second century, the city possessed two temples built by Tiberius and Hadrian, and Caracalla would later build a third. In addition, a temple of Cybele was situated on flat ground beside the harbor. Smyrna also contained shrines to Tyche (Fortune) and the two Nemeses (who were said to have instructed Alexander to rebuild the city). Smyrna was designated the νεωκόρος, or custodian, of the temples of the entire province.

The Jewish community was especially powerful and active in Smyrna.<sup>10</sup> Jews were present in Asia Minor long before the days of the Roman empire. One of Aristotle's disciples related a story of his master holding a discussion with a Jew in the region. Julius Caesar favored the Jews, and Octavius directed the Proconsul Norbanus Flaccus to allow Jews to send their customary money for the Jerusalem temple.<sup>11</sup> After Octavius became Augustus, he reiterated all the privileges of the Jews (Josephus, *Antiquities* XII.3.2; XII.3.4; XVI.2.3–5; XVI.6.1–6).

---

<sup>7</sup> Potter labels him an "extreme hypochondriac." See D. S. Potter, "Smyrna," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

<sup>8</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 264–281. Public officials were expected to use their personal wealth to benefit the city.

<sup>9</sup> T. A. Robinson, *The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church* (Lewiston: Mellen, 1988), 111.

<sup>10</sup> Robinson estimates that Jews made up more than five percent of the population in the cities of western Asia Minor (Robinson, *Bauer Thesis*, 112–116).

<sup>11</sup> See Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 303.

The relationship between Jews and their pagan neighbors was not always congenial. A Hadrianic inscription refers to οἱ ποτὲ Ἰουδαῖοι (presumably pagans who had converted to Judaism and then apostatized) who donated 10,000 drachmas to public buildings.<sup>12</sup> The Jewish *Sibylline Oracles* prophesied, "Smyrna will one day weep, rolled down the cliffs. She who was once revered and famous will perish." (*Sibylline Oracles* V.122); and "Smyrna also will come, bewailing its musician, to the gates of Ephesus, and she herself will truly perish" (*Sibylline Oracles* V.306).<sup>13</sup>

### The Smyrnaean Church

Christianity seems to have come to Smyrna during the middle of the 1st cent. A.D. Most scholars believe that Christianity spread to Smyrna from neighboring Pauline-established churches, such as Ephesus, which lay about forty miles to the south.<sup>14</sup> Paul first visited Ephesus in A.D. 50 and returned in 52 and 54. Turner, followed by Cadoux, maintains that Paul actually traveled through Smyrna on his third trip.<sup>15</sup>

The first indisputable evidence of Christianity's presence in Smyrna comes from the Book of Revelation. The Smyrnaean church was one of the seven churches of Asia addressed in the Apocalypse:

And to the angel of the church in Smyrna, write: The first and the last, who died and came to life, says these things: "I know your affliction and poverty (although you are rich), and the slander of those who claim to be Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan. Do not fear

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 348. Mommsen and Ramsay held that this referred to the Jewish community no longer legally recognized as a nation since A.D. 70 (see Hemer, *Letters*, 66).

<sup>13</sup> English translations in J. H. Charlesworth, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 343. Acts 19:10 summarizes, "All the inhabitants of Asia heard the word of the Lord." Lampakes argued that the Smyrnaean church commenced with Pentecost converts (see Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 304, n.4; cf. Hemer, *Letters*, 66). The *Life of Polycarp* implies that Christianity in Smyrna preceded Paul's visits to the area (*Life* 2).

<sup>15</sup> C. J. Cadoux, "A Tentative Synthetic Chronology of the Apostolic Age," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 56 (1937): 187-190; C. H. Turner, *Studies in Early Church History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), 174. H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of John*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1907), lxviii.

the things you are about to suffer. Behold, the devil is about to throw some of you into prison, that you may be tested, and you will have affliction for ten days. Be faithful until death, and I will give you the crown of life. Whoever has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches. The one who overcomes will by no means be hurt by the second death (Rev. 2:8–11).

The Smyrnaean church seems to have experienced internal vitality, since only the Smyrnaean and Philadelphian churches did not receive any stylized censure (“but this I have against you . . .”) from John. Some have argued that the “angel of the church in Smyrna” is in fact Polycarp.<sup>16</sup> But this unsubstantiated identification is based upon the questionable interpretation that the “angels” of the seven churches are actually elder-bishops,<sup>17</sup> as well as the debatable assumption that Polycarp would have already been the leader of the Smyrnaean church by the mid-90's (when most scholars date Revelation).

The succession of Smyrnaean church leaders is difficult if not impossible to reconstruct. According to the largely fictional *Life of Polycarp*, Stratais (brother of Timothy) led the Smyrnaean church after Paul's departure.<sup>18</sup> The *Life* promises a complete list of the Smyrnaean bishops, but even if the author composed such a register, it is no longer extant. The *Apostolic Constitutions* give the following catalog of early bishops: “And in Smyrna, first, Aristos; and after him Stratais, the son of Lois; and after him Ariston.”<sup>19</sup> What is unusual about this list is the absence of Polycarp's name. Some have argued that Polycarp's term occurred too late for inclusion. Streeter even contends that the absence of Polycarp adds to the historical value of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.<sup>20</sup> However, it may be that an anti-Quartodeciman perspective (evident in both the *Life of Polycarp* and the *Apostolic Constitutions*) wished to trace Smyrnaean tradition to Paul rather than John.<sup>21</sup> Or perhaps the church of Smyrna (which was often vying for position with Ephesus)

<sup>16</sup> Burton, Introduction, 9; cf. Kleist, *Didache*, 87.

<sup>17</sup> For an examination of the “angels” of the churches, see D. E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5* (Dallas: Word, 1997), 108–112.

<sup>18</sup> Hilgenfeld and Schmidt reject the *Life's* rendering of early Smyrnaean church leaders (Hilgenfeld, “Eine dreiste Fälschung in alter Zeit und deren neueste Verteidigung,” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 48 (1905): 458; Schmidt, *Gespräche*, 710, 713ff).

<sup>19</sup> *Apostolic Constitutions* 43. English translation in J. M. Harden, *The Ethiopic Didascalia* (London: SPCK, 1920), 187.

<sup>20</sup> Streeter, *Primitive Christianity*, 93–95.

<sup>21</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 314.

wanted to extract itself from the Johannine/Ephesian connection.<sup>22</sup> The *Life* further narrates that a man named Bucolus preceded Polycarp in office. Several late authorities claim that John the Apostle appointed Bucolus as bishop and gave him Polycarp as an assistant.<sup>23</sup> Overall, the early ecclesiastical figures in Smyrna remain shadowy.<sup>24</sup>

Christians in the vicinity of Smyrna underwent some persecution in the first half of the second century. The Proconsul Q. Licinius Granianus received a petition that Christians should be legally prosecuted, and he passed the request on to the emperor. Hadrian's reply reached Granianus' successor, G. Minucius Fundanus (A.D. 124–125). It authorized punishment for offenses proven in court, but it prohibited punishment founded only upon hearsay and assessed heavy penalties for false accusations (Justin, *Apology* 1.48.6–10; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.7.6–8; IV.36.10). Melito of Sardis mentions a rescript sent by Antoninus Pius “to the Larissians and Thessalonians and Athenians and all the Hellenes” forbidding them to disturb Christians beyond the formalities of the legal system (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.26.10).<sup>25</sup> Cadoux argues that “all the Hellenes” would have included the provinces of Western Asia Minor.<sup>26</sup>

Ignatius refers to the three offices of bishop, elder and deacon in the Smyrnaean church (*Smyrnaeans* 12.2), though many scholars have questioned his knowledge. Tied to this issue is Polycarp's purported position as bishop of Smyrna. Some have doubted whether Polycarp was ever referred to as a “bishop” at all, since he does not explicitly use this term of himself.<sup>27</sup> The introduction of

<sup>22</sup> Weidmann, “Intertextuality,” 398.

<sup>23</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 322 n.2.

<sup>24</sup> One must also remember the early ecclesiastical context: Smyrna probably contained any number of “house churches” (See H.-J. Klauck, *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981).

<sup>25</sup> A spurious rescript to Asia, perhaps inspired by Melito's reference, is still extant (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.13).

<sup>26</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 367.

<sup>27</sup> Lindemann's statement that Polycarp makes his ecclesiastical position as ἐπίσκοπος known is an overstatement (A. Lindemann, “Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers,” in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. W. S. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University, 1990), 26). Steinhauser's contention that “Polycarp identifies himself as a bishop in the inscription of the letter” (K. B. Steinhauser, “Authority in the Primitive Church,” *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 3 (1984): 97) is simply mistaken.



*Phil* merely mentions, “Polycarp and the elders with him.”<sup>28</sup> Donaldson translates the phrase as “Polycarp and those who with him are elders.”<sup>29</sup> Baur takes the phrase to refer to a church division: the elders with Polycarp as opposed to those against him.<sup>30</sup> Yet the simplest rendition remains “Polycarp and the elders who are with him.” Donaldson further insists that no inference should be made from Polycarp’s name heading the list. But it seems clear from the inscription of *Phil* as well as Ignatius’ letters to Polycarp and the Smyrnaeans that Polycarp was considered to be at least the greatest among the elders of Smyrna, not one among equals.<sup>31</sup> We may concur with Goodspeed and Grant, “Presumably he writes as bishop.”<sup>32</sup>

Among contemporaries, Ignatius does label Polycarp a “bishop”<sup>33</sup> (*Magnesians* 15; *Smyrnaeans* 9.1, 12.2; *Polycarp* inscr.), and so does the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* (16.2).<sup>34</sup> Later writers, such as Polycrates, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Eusebius, the “Harris Fragments,” and the *Life* similarly refer to Polycarp as “bishop” of Smyrna (Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III.3.4; Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* 32; Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III.36, IV.14, V.24.4; “Harris Fragment” 63r; *Life* 10).

But Donaldson continues, “As far as the statements of Irenaeus go, there is not the slightest reason for supposing that Polycarp was the only overseer in the

<sup>28</sup> But Ignatius does not refer to himself as “bishop” in his letter openings either (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 7).

<sup>29</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 240.

<sup>30</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 70. Schoedel argues against the grammatical artificiality of such a view (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 7–8).

<sup>31</sup> G. Schöllgen, “Monepiskopat und monarchischer Episkopat: Eine Bemerkung zur Terminologie,” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 77 (1986): 146–151.

<sup>32</sup> Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 17 n.3. Cf. Lightfoot: Polycarp “evidently” writes as a bishop (Lightfoot, *Apostolical Fathers* II.3, 321). This is not to deny that “bishop” and “elder” are used synonymously in several New Testament passages and in *1 Clement*. Steinhauser believes they are only used interchangeably in *1 Clement*, and this due to the differences in church structure between Rome and Corinth (Steinhauser, “Authority,” 92–95).

<sup>33</sup> Some have suggested that the term meant more to Ignatius than to Polycarp. This may undoubtedly be the case, but this does not mean that the term itself was inaptly applied.

<sup>34</sup> *Martyrdom* 16.2 is one of the passages for which a strong case of interpolation can be made (Campenhausen, *Bearbeitungen*, 22–23; Reunig, *Zur Erklärung*, 21–22). The Moscow Epilogue to the *Martyrdom* also terms Polycarp a “bishop.”

church in Smyrna.”<sup>35</sup> Donaldson translates Irenaeus’ *Adversus haereses* III.3 as follows:

And Polycarp, who was not only instructed by apostles, and had intercourse with many who had seen Christ, but was also appointed for Asia by apostles, in the church that is in Smyrna, an overseer, whom also we have seen in the beginning of our life, for he remained a long time, and at an exceedingly old age, having borne his testimony gloriously and most notably, departed his life, always taught these things, which also he learned from the apostles, which also he gave to the Church, and which alone are true.<sup>36</sup>

Donaldson argues, “The words εἰς Ἀσίαν κατασταθείς simply express the region to which the apostles appointed him. And the clause that follows is a separate and positive statement that he was an overseer in the church in Smyrna.”<sup>37</sup> For Donaldson, this translation proves that Polycarp was “only one of the number” of bishops.<sup>38</sup> But Donaldson’s rendition of ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων κατασταθείς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος is awkward. Admittedly, the Greek does not include a definite article before ἐπίσκοπος, but Donaldson’s translation is artificial, and all the evidence points to Polycarp being greater than an equal in an egalitarian board of elders/bishops. Furthermore, Polycarp did not hesitate to send Ignatius’ *Smyrnaeans* and *Polycarp* on to Philippi, both of which identified him as “bishop of the Smyrnaean church” (*Smyrnaeans* 12.2; *Polycarp* inscr.).<sup>39</sup>

The question of Polycarp’s celibacy has sometimes been tied to his episcopacy. The *Life of Polycarp* asserts that he refused to impede his religious duties with family affairs (*Life* 9). Zahn contends that Polycarp’s reference to “your wives” in *Phil* 4.2 substantiates this claim,<sup>40</sup> but Schoedel rightly argues that this evidence is minimal.<sup>41</sup> Admittedly, the change from first person to second person is somewhat awkward:

---

<sup>35</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 195.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 192.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 195.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 283–284.

<sup>40</sup> Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 337–338. Cf. Lightfoot’s approval in *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 328.

<sup>41</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 17.

Let us arm ourselves with the armour of righteousness, and let us first of all teach ourselves to walk in the commandment of the Lord; next teach your wives to remain in the faith given to them, and in love and purity, tenderly loving their husbands in all truth, and loving all others equally in all chastity, and to educate their children in the fear of God.

Lake argues that the confusion between ὑμῶν and ἡμῶν is so common (cf. my chapter 4), that “our” may “safely be restored.”<sup>42</sup> This may be the case. However, another explanation is possible: Polycarp may commence with the first person plural since he has just used a source in this person: “Knowing therefore that ‘we brought nothing into the world and we can take nothing out of it,’ let us arm ourselves with the armour. . . .” (1 Tim. 6:7). Later, he easily adjusts to the second person to engage his audience: “Next, teach your wives . . .” In sum, the passage does not prove Polycarp’s celibacy. On the opposite end of the spectrum, Simcox’s suggestion that Alce was the wife of Polycarp is completely unsubstantiated.<sup>43</sup>

The passage from Revelation is intriguing due to its implication of Jewish-Christian relations in Smyrna. It seems that the Jews were giving Christians a difficult time, and the Apocalypse responds by calling them the “synagogue (συναγωγή) of Satan” (Rev. 2:9)<sup>44</sup> Jewish-Christian tensions may have reached back to the very introduction of Christianity in Smyrna. Unless the situation in Smyrna differed from the rest of western Asia Minor, many Christian converts came from Jews and Gentile God-fearers.<sup>45</sup> This proselytization would have created jealousy and conflict. Perhaps the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple caused ripple effects in Asia Minor and added to the tensions there.<sup>46</sup>

We know for sure that Jewish-Christian relations did not improve. The *Martyrdom of Polycarp* accuses Jews of playing a part in the death of Polycarp (12–13), as do the “Harris Fragments” (64v + 56r). Reportedly, Jews took an active part in the collection of wood and faggots for the fire. After Polycarp’s

---

<sup>42</sup> Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 286 n.1.

<sup>43</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 440; cf. Salmon, “Polycarpus.” See Ignatius, *Smyrnaeans* 13.2; *Polycarp* 8.3).

<sup>44</sup> The use of συναγωγή appears to point toward Jewish hostility. For a discussion of the phrase “synagogue of Satan,” see Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 164–165. Cf. also Rev. 3:9.

<sup>45</sup> Harnack muses, “Smyrna was originally a small church, oppressed by a powerful Jewish society” (A. von Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, 2nd ed. (New York: Putnam, 1908), 186).

<sup>46</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 311–312.

execution, Jews and Christians gathered around the pyre, arguing about the remains of his body (*Martyrdom* 17–18).<sup>47</sup> The centurion settled the matter by reducing the corpse to ashes. Abrahams doubted this portrayal and argued that it was an unhistorical assimilation with the Gospels.<sup>48</sup> However, Jewish-Christian and Christian-Jewish animosity is attested in other sources, and there does not seem to be sufficient grounds to doubt a historical core of the incident.<sup>49</sup>

The *Life of Polycarp* reveals the continuing strains between the Christian and Jewish communities. It relates that Polycarp engaged in controversy with Jews, Gentiles, and heretics. Even if, as we have argued, the (late) *Life* is of minimal historical value in reconstructing Polycarp's actual career, the statement at least reflects Christian-Jewish tensions at the time of composition (fourth century?). The *Life* further accuses the Jews of "offering" their fire extinguishing abilities in cases of conflagrations in order to plunder the property and homes. This accusation may be discarded as authorial anti-Jewish propaganda.

The Smyrnaean bishop Pionius (mid-third century) exhibited violent antagonism against the Jews (*Martyrdom of Pionius* 4.13ff). Jews were later accused of having a role in his execution, when he was killed c. A.D. 250. The role of the Jews may be exaggerated by the *Martyrdom of Pionius*' attempt to circumvent the problem of Christians who accepted an invitation to worship in the local Jewish synagogue in order to escape persecution (*Martyrdom of Pionius* 13.1), but some role is not improbable.

## The City of Philippi

Philippi is a city in eastern Macedonia. It lies in the fertile plain of Dato nine miles from the Aegean Sea, but it has ready naval access through the seaport of

---

<sup>47</sup> In this curious narration, the Jews are worried that the Christians will abandon the worship of Jesus and worship Polycarp instead. The section may be framed by a desire to downplay the adoration of martyrs. See discussions in W. Rordorf, "Aux origines du culte des martyrs," *Irenikon* 45 (1972): 315–331; W. Frei, "Bischof Polykarp von Smyrna und die beginnende Heiligenverehrung," *Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift* 72 (1983) 207–213.

<sup>48</sup> Abrahams, *Studies*, 67–69.

<sup>49</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 361 n.4.

Neapolis. Thracians inhabited the site (which they called Krenides, or “Springs”) until 360 B.C., when settlers from the island of Thasos under the leadership of the exiled Athenian Callistratus captured the site. Their rule was short-lived, as Philip II of Macedonia captured the city in 356 B.C. and renamed it after himself. Philip helped finance his military ventures largely through the gold he mined from nearby Mt. Pangaeum.

The Romans took control of the city in 130 B.C. Philippi became a provincial outpost on the Via Egnatia, which linked the Adriatic Sea with the Bosphorus. The Via Egnatia ran through the center of Philippi and doubled as the town’s main street (*decumanus maximus*). The armies of Antony and Octavian fought and defeated Julius Caesar’s assassins Brutus and Cassius only two miles away (42 B.C.). After the battle, Antony established a military colony at Philippi for many of his ex-soldiers (*Colonia Victrix*). Augustus resettled as many as five hundred more Roman soldiers there after the Battle of Actium (31 B.C.). He refounded the colony as *Colonia Julia Augusta Philippensis* (in honor of his daughter),<sup>50</sup> and he granted it the *ius Italicum*, meaning that colonists could enjoy the same rights of proprietorship as those living in Italy.

Epigraphic evidence indicates that Philippi suffered economically in the first century A.D. due to the disrepair of the Via Egnatia. Trajan repaired the road early in the second century, and most visible Roman buildings date between the reigns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. The Romans enlarged a theater built during the reign of Philip II so that it could hold about 8000 spectators. Archaeologists have cleared the forum, which dates from the reign of Marcus Aurelius.<sup>51</sup> A market, a *παλαίστρα* (athletic school) with an exercise field, a small amphitheater, and underground latrines have been uncovered. An ornate bath complex was built during the third century A.D., 200 meters south of the *παλαίστρα*.<sup>52</sup>

The inhabitants of Philippi would have included Thracians, Greeks, and the descendants of Roman veterans. Latin prevails in inscriptions, but Greek and

---

<sup>50</sup> It was named “*Colonia Augusta Iulia Philippensis*” (“*Colonia Iulia Augusta Philippensis*”) after January 16, 27 B.C. It had been named “*Colonia Iulia Philippensis*” in 30 B.C. (P. Collart, *Philippes, ville de Macédoine depuis ses origines jusqu’à la fin de l’époque romaine*. 2 vols. Paris: Boccard, 1937), 228–237).

<sup>51</sup> Grant, *Guide to the Ancient World*, s.v. “Philippi.”

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

Thracian are also used. Romans seem to have dominated the administration of Philippi, and even the common Roman designations were used. Epigraphic evidence refers to aediles, quaestors, and duumviri.

There does not seem to have been a sizable Jewish community in Philippi. In fact, based upon the tradition of Lydia and the other women meeting at a place of prayer (προσευχή) outside the city by the riverside, some have inferred that there was not a large enough Jewish community in the first century to sustain a synagogue.<sup>53</sup> A recently discovered inscription does reveal the existence of a Philippian synagogue in the third or fourth century.<sup>54</sup> The only other attestation of the presence of Jews in Philippi is the book of Acts.<sup>55</sup>

The Thracian Bacchus, Bendis (associated with Diana and Artemis), and the Thracian rider hero were important religious figures in Philippi. Herodotus relates that a Thracian oracle of Dionysus was located at nearby Mt. Pangaeum. Shrines of Diana/Artemis/Bendis, Cybele (Magna Mater), and Silvanus (a Roman god of forests) have been identified in a quarry north of the Via Egnatia. The sanctuaries date from the first or second centuries A.D.<sup>56</sup> The remains of a Bacchus shrine (found underneath the second century A.D. bath complex, 400 meters south of the Egnatia) include inscriptions dedicated to Liber, Libera, Hercules, and Liber Pater. Many of the dedicants were females, indicating that women participated even in the cult of Hercules.<sup>57</sup> The remains of temples of Apollo Komaïos and Artemis have been dated to the later fourth century B.C.<sup>58</sup> Egyptian gods were honored in a sanctuary made of imported marble situated on a ledge at the base of the acropolis hill. The acropolis itself sat 310 meters above sea level and bears 187 rock-cut reliefs, including carvings of Cybele, the Thracian rider hero, Jupiter, Minerva, and Isis, but primarily of Diana/Artemis/Bendis. Two ἱεῖα (shrines for

---

<sup>53</sup> J. E. Stambaugh and D. L. Balch, *The New Testament in Its Social Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 155–156.

<sup>54</sup> C. Koukouli-Chrysantaki, "Colonia Iulia Augusta Philippensis," in *Philippi at the Time of Paul and after His Death*. Ed. C. Bakirtzis and H. Koester (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1998), 28–35.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 28.

<sup>56</sup> H. L. Hendrix, "Philippi," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> Grant, *Guide to the Ancient World*, s.v. "Philippi."

heroes) have also been discovered in Philippi,<sup>59</sup> as well as evidence of imperial cults.<sup>60</sup>

## The Philippian Church

Paul became the first Christian missionary to Philippi in A.D. 49 (Acts 16:11–40).<sup>61</sup> Polycarp notes that the Philippians had “known the Lord” prior to the Smyrnaeans (*Phil* 11.3), apparently referring to their early evangelization by Paul. Paul’s first converts in Philippi included Lydia, a dealer in purple cloth. According to Acts, Paul was imprisoned in Philippi after running into trouble with the owners of a slave girl who possessed an oracular spirit. He later wrote an epistle to the Philippians.<sup>62</sup> One reason Paul wrote the letter was to thank the church for their financial assistance (Philippians 4:10–20). Accordingly, the letter is primarily positive in tone, though he warns of the possibility of legalistic teachers (3:1–4) and exhorts two women (Euodia and Syntyche) to end their quarreling (4:1–3).

Philippians 1:1 states that Paul’s correspondence was written “to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.” Some have argued that this is a later interpolation,<sup>63</sup> but the textual evidence does not bear this out. On the other hand, because *Phil* does not refer to the episcopacy,<sup>64</sup> some have

<sup>59</sup> Scholars propose that the ἡρώων north of the Via Egnatia facilitated the cult of Philipp II. See Koukoulis-Chrysantaki, “Colonia,” 18–19.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>61</sup> For a fuller discussion of the history of the Christian community in Philippi, see L. Bormann, *Philippi: Stadt und Christengemeinde zur Zeit des Paulus* (Leiden: Brill, 1995); and P. Pilhofer, *Philippi, Band I: Die erste christliche Gemeinde Europas* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).

<sup>62</sup> Philippians is dated between the 50s and early 60s, depending upon whether one places the writing in an Ephesian or a Roman imprisonment; some have argued that our present letter is a composite work – see my chapter 13.

<sup>63</sup> J. Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1918), 171; J. H. Michael, *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians* (New York: Doubleday, 1927), 4–7; W. Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), 11 n.5; E. Best, “Bishop and Deacons: Philippians 1,1,” *Studia Evangelica* 4 (1968), 371–76.

<sup>64</sup> For instance, compare *Phil* 5.2 and Ignatius, *Magnesians* 6.1–2. In the former, presbyters stand in the place of God; in the latter, bishops do. Cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 332.

suggested that it had not yet been organized in Philippi, or that it was temporarily vacant.<sup>65</sup> Quasten infers that "One might be justified in concluding that the Christian community of Philippi was governed by a committee of presbyters."<sup>66</sup> But the functions of presbyters and bishops may not yet have been differentiated at Philippi.<sup>67</sup>

## The Ignatian Journey

The distance from Smyrna to Neapolis (Philippi's port) by sea approaches 500 kilometers, via Troas. Ramsay notes that this naval trip would take five days, perhaps seven with adverse winds.<sup>68</sup> If one traveled by road to Troas, and then by ship to Neapolis, the journey would take a little longer (eight or nine days minimum for the approximately 250 kilometers on land and three days for the sea trip from Troas to Neapolis).<sup>69</sup> But even in this case, one could normally get from one to the other within about two weeks.<sup>70</sup>

Whatever their past relationship may have been, the Ignatian journey brought the churches of Smyrna and Philippi into contact again.<sup>71</sup> Ignatius began his journey in Antioch and traveled through Asia Minor to Smyrna. From Smyrna,

---

<sup>65</sup> Salmon, "Polycarpus." Cf. R. Knopf, *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920), 179–181; Steinhauser, "Authority," 97; A. Michiels, *L'origène de l'épiscopat* (Louvain: n.p., 1900), 367f; A. Harnack, *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1910), 59f.

<sup>66</sup> Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 1, 80. Lightfoot states that "the spread of the episcopate was not uniform throughout Christendom, and that some churches, as for instance Philippi, had not yet adopted it" (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 395ff). Cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Letters*, 262, 284. Bauer's contention that the bishop of Philippi was heretical since he is not addressed by Polycarp (as well as his further theory that the entire church of Thessalonica was heretical, since Polycarp did not write them) builds too much upon an argument from silence (see Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 74).

<sup>67</sup> Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 199–200.

<sup>68</sup> W. M. Ramsay, "Roads and Travel (in the New Testament)," in *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. J. Hastings (New York: Scribner's, 1904).

<sup>69</sup> Acts places the sea trip from Troas to Neapolis at two days (16:11) and five days (20:6).

<sup>70</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 111.

<sup>71</sup> In chapter 5, I will argue that Polycarp and the Philippians had had contact prior to Ignatius' trip.



he wrote four epistles (*Ephesians*, *Magnesians*, *Trallians*, and *Romans*). His entourage moved on from Smyrna to Troas, a trip taking three to four days by sea and seven to eight days by land.<sup>72</sup> Ignatius wrote epistles to the *Philadelphians*, *Smyrnaeans*, and *Polycarp* before disembarking from Troas.<sup>73</sup> From Troas, Ignatius sailed to Neapolis and then journeyed to Philippi. It is assumed that he continued his journey and eventually faced martyrdom in Rome.<sup>74</sup>

We do not know precisely the year which brought Ignatius on his trip through Smyrna and Philippi.<sup>75</sup> Irenaeus is the first author (outside of the Ignatian and Polycarpian material) to mention Ignatius, but he does not place his references in a chronological setting.

Eusebius' *Chronicon* places Ignatius' martyrdom at A.D. 108 during Trajan's reign, but it seems that he may simply have been guessing when he placed it with this exactness.<sup>76</sup> The *Chronicon* groups the martyrdom in the same year with Pliny's condemnation of Christians,<sup>77</sup> which scholars date to A.D. 112.<sup>78</sup>

Scholars have looked to buttress Eusebius' placement during Trajan's reign.<sup>79</sup> Both Eusebius and Origen (*Sixth Homily on Luke*) assert that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch, which would seem to place him relatively early; but this leads one into the thorny issue of succession lists.<sup>80</sup> Dating the martyrdom c. 115 places it within the reign of Trajan, who is known to have allowed the

<sup>72</sup> Ramsay, "Roads." Cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 111–117.

<sup>73</sup> Knopf argued that the *Epistle to Polycarp* was written from Neapolis, not Troas (Knopf, *Apostolischen Väter*, 36). But his argument is founded upon the misinterpretation of an epistolary aorist in the *Epistle to Polycarp* 8.1 (see Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 338 n.1).

<sup>74</sup> For a brief discussion of the unhistorical Roman and Antiochene Acts of Ignatius, see Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 274 n.6; 287 n.51. Burton unwisely incorporates the Ignatian Acts material into his history (Burton, Introduction, 13).

<sup>75</sup> See the discussion in Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 209–230, 315.

<sup>76</sup> Turner, *Studies*, 138. The *Chronicon* is often considered unreliable for exact dating.

<sup>77</sup> Jerome's version of the *Chronicon* moves the Bithynian oppression under Pliny to the following year.

<sup>78</sup> Pliny did not become governor of Bithynia until A.D. 111.

<sup>79</sup> Lightfoot's attempt to find support by combining Ignatius' warnings to the Roman church not to stop his death with the presence of Domitilla in Rome holds little weight (cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 229–230).

<sup>80</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 348. This is especially true, since Origen states that Peter was the first bishop of Antioch.

persecution of Christians (Pliny, *Epistles* X.96–97).<sup>81</sup> Minimal support may perhaps be found in John Malalas' (sixth century) reference to the arrest of Ignatius in Antioch at the time of an earthquake during Trajan's visit in A.D. 115.<sup>82</sup> The Antiochene Acts of Ignatius, the Roman Acts, and a Syriac Chronicle all agree that the events took place during Trajan's reign. This evidence appears useful, since both the Antiochene Acts and the Syriac Chronicle place the martyrdom in Antioch, and may therefore represent an independent tradition.<sup>83</sup> In the end, only one source appears to place the event outside of Trajan's reign: John Madabbar (seventh century) states that "Endreynos (Hadrian) sent Ignatius to Rome in chains, and delivered him to the lions." But even this author actually indirectly supports the Trajanic setting: John Madabbar has just asserted that "After the death of the good king Arivâs (Nerva), Endreynos (Hadrian) reigned." He evidently has confused Hadrian with Trajan in his succession of emperors.<sup>84</sup> In the end, no external evidence exists which would cause us to question Eusebius' placement during the reign of Trajan.<sup>85</sup>

Lightfoot maintained a date between 100 and 118.<sup>86</sup> Corwin remained content with the rough estimation between 108 and 117.<sup>87</sup> Cadoux argued that a year late in Trajan's reign is to be preferred.<sup>88</sup> In 1886, Harnack wrote, "Ought we to suspend by spider's thread of a fourth-century *Logos* the weight of a decision which sets for us a hundred questions?"<sup>89</sup> But by 1897, he argued for a date in

<sup>81</sup> Origen states that Ignatius was killed during "the persecution," which would fit Trajan's reign better than Hadrian's. Ignatius, *Ephesians* 12.2 seems to imply a similar persecution.

<sup>82</sup> Streeter, *Primitive Church*, 274–276. Essig defends Malalas' evidence (K.-G. Essig, "Mutmassungen über den Anlaß des Martyriums von Ignatius von Antiochien," *Vigiliae Christianae* 40 (1986): 105–117). Earlier, Harrison had discounted Malalas' testimony (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 221–225).

<sup>83</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 224–225. In fact, Völter followed these sources and placed the martyrdom in Antioch (Völter, *Polykarp*, 137–171). But the evidence of the primary source material (the Ignatian letters) rules out such a theory.

<sup>84</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 230.

<sup>85</sup> The origin of Eusebius' information is uncertain. He simply introduces his account of the martyrdom with λόγος δ' ἔχει (see Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 213–217).

<sup>86</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.2, 435–72. "His martyrdom may with a high degree of probability be placed within a few years of A.D. 110, before or after" (ibid., II.1, 30).

<sup>87</sup> Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 3.

<sup>88</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 324–325.

<sup>89</sup> Harnack, "Lightfoot," 191.

Trajan's reign between 110 and 117, or possibly in the early Hadrianic period before 125.<sup>90</sup> By 1921, he was simply satisfied with a Trajanic setting.<sup>91</sup> In sum, Ignatius' martyrdom fell "in all likelihood" sometime before Trajan's reign ended in A.D. 117.<sup>92</sup>

Perhaps the arrest of Ignatius and his subsequent journey can be tied to Trajan's eastern trip in 114.<sup>93</sup> Some interpreters have attempted a more exact calendar date. Ignatius dates his *Epistle to the Romans* as being written on the ninth day before the Kalends of September, or August 24 (*Romans* 11.2). This is the only Ignatian letter which is dated, causing Corwin to argue that Ignatius wrote the epistle shortly before he left Smyrna in order to give the Romans an indication of his date of arrival.<sup>94</sup> If so, Ignatius resided in Smyrna during the summer. He must have spent a fair amount of time there, since he was able to greet various Smyrnaean acquaintances in his subsequent correspondence (*Smyrnaeans* 13).<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> Harnack, *Chronologie*, vol. 1, 381–406. Cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 211–230.

<sup>91</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 21–40, 3–5\*.

<sup>92</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 274. Schoedel states this, although he later curiously asserts that the dating is "a matter of great uncertainty and could conceivably be placed anywhere between A.D. 105 and A.D. 135" (*ibid.*, 349). Earlier, Schoedel had declared that "few seem disposed to challenge the suggestion that it was within Trajan's reign" (*idem*, *Polycarp*, 4).

<sup>93</sup> W. H. Groß, "M. Ulpius Traianus," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* Supplementband X (Stuttgart: Druckenmüller, 1965), 1094–1098.

<sup>94</sup> Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 17. Cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 111.

<sup>95</sup> See Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 326.

## Chapter 4

### The Text and Authenticity of Philipians

Having examined the figure of Polycarp and the Smyrnaean and Philippian contexts, I now turn to his letter, the *Epistle to the Philipians*. This letter, which seems to be his only extant work, is usually classed among the writings of the “Apostolic Fathers.”<sup>1</sup>

#### Polycarp’s Writings

We know that Polycarp composed other works besides *Phil.* In a letter to Florinus, a friend who had fallen into heresy, Irenaeus refers to several letters composed by their former teacher. According to Irenaeus, Polycarp’s aversion to heresy is clearly manifested in “his letters which he sent either to the neighbouring churches, strengthening them, or to some of the brethren, exhorting and warning them” (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.20.8; English translation in *LCL*).<sup>2</sup> The *Life of Polycarp* states,

He wrote also many treatises and sermons and letters, but in the persecution which arose on his account, when he was martyred, certain lawless heathen carried them off. Their character however is evident from those still extant, among which the Epistle to the Philipians was the most adequate (*Life* 12).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This term seems to have originated late in the seventeenth century. For a brief history of the term, see Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 11: In 1672, J.-B. Cotelierius published *Ss. patrum, qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt* (Paris: Petri le Petit, 1672). In 1699, Ittis collected the *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum*. They were “implicitly” called the Apostolic Fathers a millennium earlier (Grant, *Formation*, 62).

<sup>2</sup> Harrison uses this passage to argue that Irenaeus was aware of various Polycarpian letters, and that he had even read them (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 17, 52). Irenaeus’ statements do not necessarily warrant such a conclusion, though it is not impossible (see Batiffol, “Polycarp”).

<sup>3</sup> English translation in Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 494. Lightfoot argued that the *Life*’s statements were fiction founded upon Irenaeus’ letter to Florinus which mentions “letters” sent to “neighboring churches” and “some of the brethren” (ibid., II.1, 473; see *Historia ecclesiastica*

The *Life* also promised to include an example of Polycarp's scriptural exposition (*Life* 20). Extant copies of the *Life* do not contain this work, and many scholars believe that the reference actually alludes to *Phil.*<sup>4</sup> Even if several letters were extant at the time of the writing of the *Life* (and this is doubtful, see below), they are now lost. Jerome protests a rumor that he had translated "the volumes of Papias and Polycarp" (*Epistle* 71.5: *Epistula ad Lucinium*). Because of the nature of the evidence (the denial of a rumor), one may not necessarily assume that volumes of Polycarp's writings were actually available in the time of Jerome.

Two later writers, Maximus the Confessor and Suidas, claim to give us the titles of some of Polycarp's other works.<sup>5</sup> Maximus (a seventh century commentator on pseudo-Dionysius) mentions a Polycarpian work entitled *Didache* and a letter to the Athenian church in which he addressed Dionysius.<sup>6</sup> Suidas claims that the seventh of the pseudo-Dionysian letters was composed in response to a previous Polycarpian letter.<sup>7</sup> The likelihood of these works being authentic is minimal, since the earlier authors knew nothing of them. Furthermore, the pseudonymity of the Dionysian collection speaks for itself.

Feuardentius mentioned some purported fragments from the so-called "Responsiones of Polycarp" found in Victor of Capua (5th or 6th century A.D.), but most have not accepted them. Unfortunately, the manuscripts have been lost.<sup>8</sup> Wake followed Ussher and Halloix in rejecting these fragments because of the time lapse between Polycarp and Victor, Victor's faults in distinguishing the works of the Fathers, the lack of agreement between the fragments and the apostolic age, and the lack of reference to these works in the early Fathers.<sup>9</sup> "At best they are entirely unauthenticated, though there is nothing in them greatly opposed to their being the work of Polycarp."<sup>10</sup> Lightfoot also argued from internal evidence (the *legitur et in dolio* at the end of fragment 2, for instance) that

---

V.20). Harrison disagrees with this assessment (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 17). For the *Life's* dependence on Irenaeus in general, see Dehandschutter, "Martyrium Polycarpi," 491–492.

<sup>4</sup> Schwartz, *De Pionio*, 30. Cf. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 307–308.

<sup>5</sup> Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 84; See also Meinhold, "Polykarpos," 1691.

<sup>6</sup> See Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 347 n.5.

<sup>7</sup> See *ibid.*, 346 n.4.

<sup>8</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 419–422.

<sup>9</sup> Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 84; Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 229.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 229.

the fragments were false.<sup>11</sup> Lightfoot further weakened the theory when he showed that the “Responsiones” were actually the work of Victor in which he quoted Polycarp, and the catena were compiled by a still later author. One is dealing with a quotation of a quotation. Cadoux accordingly labels the fragments “clearly spurious or extremely dubious.”<sup>12</sup> The same conclusion pertains to supposed Polycarpian fragments in Pitra and Ananias of Shirak (b. 650).<sup>13</sup>

Probably most telling against such theories is the fact that neither Irenaeus, Eusebius, Jerome, nor Photius evidence a direct knowledge of the contents of other works besides *Phil.*<sup>14</sup> I would add that the author of the *Life of Polycarp* is only familiar with *Phil.*, even though he refers to Polycarp’s sermons, treatises, and letters. Although he claims that other Polycarpian compositions are extant (*Life* 12), he can apparently only find *Phil.*<sup>15</sup>

Thus, of all of Polycarp’s writings, only Polycarp’s *Phil* has survived.<sup>16</sup> Concerning this letter, Irenaeus writes, “There is also a very powerful <ικανότατη, sufficient> epistle of Polycarp written to the Philippians from which those who choose to do so, and are anxious about their salvation, can learn the character of his faith, and the preaching of the truth” (*Adversus haereses* III.3.4; English translation in *ANF*).<sup>17</sup> From this statement, Schoedel infers that Irenaeus

<sup>11</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 421.

<sup>12</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 347 n.5; cf. Salmon, “Polycarpus.” Bover tried to defend the authenticity of the fragments, but was successful only to the point of demonstrating that the fragments probably come from a Greek original (Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1690–1691). Harnack’s conclusion that the fragments come from the rebuttal of a certain Pacatus (a Latin rhetor) to Porphyry’s *Against the Christians* has not found support. See a critique in Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1689–1690.

<sup>13</sup> See Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1691.

<sup>14</sup> Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 83–84.

<sup>15</sup> Lightfoot went so far as to argue that the editor of the *Life* wished to assemble a *Corpus Polycarpianum* (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 424–425). Recently, Dehandschutter has challenged this supposition of a formal *Corpus Polycarpianum* (Dehandschutter, *Martyrium Polycarpi*, 72–109).

<sup>16</sup> I will disregard Hirsch’s contention that Polycarp wrote the Ignatian correspondence (E. Hirsch, *Studien zum vierten Evangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1936), 147). See Meinhold’s critique (Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1683). The issue of Polycarp’s possible authorship of the Pastoral Epistles will be discussed in chapter 13.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.14.8.

did not read any Polycarpian work besides *Phil*.<sup>18</sup> Eusebius quotes chapters 9 and 13 of *Phil* (*Historia ecclesiastica* III.36.13–15), and notes that the letter was still available and that it made use of 1 Peter (*Historia ecclesiastica* V.14). Jerome states that this letter to the Philippians was read *in conventu Asiae* until his own day (*De viris illustribus* 17). Interpreters are probably correct in interpreting this phrase as a reference to the reading of *Phil* in public assemblies in Asia Minor.<sup>19</sup> “Il n’est nullement invraisemblable que la lettre de Polycarpe ait été lue dans les assemblées liturgiques.”<sup>20</sup>

Photius commented, ἀνεγνώσθη καὶ Πολύκαρπου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Φιλιππίσιους γεμούσα πολλῆς νοουθεσίας μετὰ σαφήνειας καὶ ἀπλότητος κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν τῆς ἐρμηνείας τύπον (*Bibliotheca* 126).<sup>21</sup> Timotheus (A.D. 457) and Severus (A.D. 513–518) cited *Phil*, and their quotations have been translated into Syriac along with the rest of their works. Nicephorus (d. 828) placed the epistles of Clement, the epistles of Ignatius, and *Phil* among his non-canonical apocrypha.<sup>22</sup>

As Kleist notes, the loss of Polycarp’s remaining correspondence is “sincerely regretted by students of early Christianity.”<sup>23</sup> Wake has reasonably hypothesized that of all Polycarp’s writings, only *Phil* survived because it was attached to the Ignatian collection.

For being often transcribed together with those of Ignatius, and commonly placed at the front of them, they mutually helped to secure each other: whilst the rest of his writings, for the want of being thus collected together, have for a long time been so utterly lost to the world. . . .<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 3; Harrison maintains that this is “not necessarily” the case (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Letters*, 17). Cf. Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.20.8.

<sup>19</sup> E.g., Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 224–225.

<sup>20</sup> Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 191. Batiffol expresses doubt: “But the assertion remains unconfirmed, and everybody knows that Jerome often wrote very hurriedly” (Batiffol, “Polycarp”).

<sup>21</sup> Photius, *Bibliothèque*, ed. R. Henry (Paris: Société d’Édition “Les Belles Lettres,” 1960).

<sup>22</sup> Daillé misunderstood Nicephorus to mean that *Phil*, the Clementine letters, and the Ignatian letters were spurious; but for Nicephorus, “apocrypha” simply means non-canonical (see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 349–353).

<sup>23</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 73; cf. Burton, Introduction, 12.

<sup>24</sup> Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 83–84.

## Style of Philipians

Whereas Irenaeus called *Phil* a “very adequate” or “very sufficient (ικανότατη)” epistle, most modern scholarship has not shared his view.<sup>25</sup> Scholars have tended to discount Polycarp’s paraenetic material as purely non-creative and uninteresting. Batiffol wrote, “Elle est toute en exhortations qui seraient d’un intérêt médiocre . . .”<sup>26</sup> Dibelius states, “er <Polycarp> einen völlig unorigenellen, sehr unbedeutenden, aber gutgemeinten Brief hinterlassen hat.”<sup>27</sup> Schwegler describes *Phil* as

an extraordinarily poor, weak, unconnected compilation of Old and New Testament passages, a trivial stringing together of commonplaces, liturgical formulas, and moral admonitions; a letter without occasion and object, without individuality and prominent character, without idiosyncrasy in language and ideas, entirely unworthy of the great chief of the churches of Asia Minor.<sup>28</sup>

Puech laments that “L’Épître est d’un contenu si banal dans l’ensemble et sa composition si malhabile” that an analysis of it “ne mène à rien.”<sup>29</sup> Maier concurs that “The tendency of scholars has been to pass over this material as purely traditional or uninteresting.”<sup>30</sup> Dehandschutter concludes, “A long florilegium of negative statements could be compiled.”<sup>31</sup>

Analogously, many have described Polycarp’s own personality in similar terms. Cadoux writes, “Judging from Polykarp’s epistles, as from all else that we learn about him, we gather that he was not endowed with great intellectual ability.”<sup>32</sup> Barnard avers that Polycarp was “a rather unimaginative, conservative

---

<sup>25</sup> See comments in Bovon-Thurneysen, “Ethik,” 241: “Dieser Vernachlässigung gegenüber stehen jedoch die urchristlichen Zeugnisse, die von Polycarp als einer bedeutenden geistigen Persönlichkeit reden.”

<sup>26</sup> P. Batiffol, *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes*, vol. 1: *La littérature grecque*, 4th ed. (Paris: Lecoffre, 1901), 17.

<sup>27</sup> M. Dibelius, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, (München: Kaiser, 1926), 119.

<sup>28</sup> Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, 154. English translation from Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 225.

<sup>29</sup> Puech, Review, 102.

<sup>30</sup> Maier, “Purity,” 6.

<sup>31</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 275.

<sup>32</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 346; he later refers to the “simplicity of his mind” (ibid., 346–347).



writer.”<sup>33</sup> Salmon writes, “He owes <his> prominence less to intellectual ability, in which he does not appear to have been pre-eminent, than to the influence gained by a consistent and unusually long life.”<sup>34</sup> Another states, “He does not seem to have been a man of great mental capacity. ‘His influence was that of saintliness rather than that of intellect.’”<sup>35</sup> “Polycarp had no creative genius”; he was a “transmitter, not a maker.”<sup>36</sup> Nielsen describes the mind of Polycarp as “receptive and not creative,” and he goes on to claim that Polycarp evidences “some limits of intelligence” because he was not very “clever.”<sup>37</sup> Polycarp is regularly caricatured as “ultra-conservative,” because he simply strands together past traditions with seemingly no personal creativity.<sup>38</sup> Schoedel contends that the “slower moving disposition” of Polycarp cannot be “brushed so lightly aside.”<sup>39</sup> Evidence for Polycarp’s “phlegmatic” personality comes from Ignatius’ exhortation to Polycarp to “be more diligent than you are” (*Polycarp* 3.2). But such a psychological reading may go beyond the Ignatian evidence.

It is true that Polycarp’s “calm and sedate” style differs drastically from Ignatius’ “fiery, abrupt, and impetuous” style.<sup>40</sup> It is also true that “The epistle is so commonplace and intelligible that in one sense, at least, it is really neither.”<sup>41</sup> But more recent scholarship has somewhat vindicated Polycarp. Schoedel balances his words, “The letter is not a distinguished document from a literary or theological point of view, but it reveals a man who could be relied on for a sane and cautious approach to religious and administrative problems.”<sup>42</sup> Dehandschutter especially has stressed Polycarp’s creativity in the reception and

---

<sup>33</sup> Barnard, “Problem,” 35.

<sup>34</sup> Salmon, “Polycarpus.”

<sup>35</sup> Andrews, “Polycarp.”

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Nielsen, “Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures,” 200, 205.

<sup>38</sup> E. Renan, *L’église chrétienne*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1922), 433. For this very reason, Harrison wishes more of Polycarp’s works survived, since his tendency to preserve tradition would “make his writings in some respects all the more valuable as historical documents” (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 6).

<sup>39</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 38.

<sup>40</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 69. Lightfoot used the differences to maintain their authenticities: “No two documents of early Christianity differ more widely in all the main characteristics by which identity or difference of authorship is tested” (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 335).

<sup>41</sup> Nielsen, “Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures,” 199.

<sup>42</sup> Schoedel, “Polycarp, Epistle of.”

use of past traditions.<sup>43</sup> It seems to me that we must keep two salient points in mind: First, our entire understanding of Polycarp's writing style and personality is based upon one extant epistle written for one specific occasion. Second, most of these caricatures are based upon a false dichotomy between creativity and the conservative use of tradition. In chapters 9, 11, and 12, I will address what I consider to be Polycarp's masterfully innovative use of traditional materials.

### Textual Criticism of *Philippians*

Nine Greek manuscripts of Polycarp's letter are extant.<sup>44</sup> The Funk-Bihlmeyer text employs *Vaticanus* 859 (v), *Ottobonianus* 348 (o), *Florentinus Laurentianus* VII.21 (f), *Parisinus Bibl. Nat.* 937 (p), *Romanus Bibl. Casanatensis* 334 (c), *Barberinus <Theatinus>* (t), *Neapolitanus Borbonicus Bibl. Nat. II.A.17* (n), and *Andros Hagias* 64 (a). In the first four manuscripts, *Phil* is found after the so-called "Long Recension" of the Ignatian corpus. *Phil* stands alone in the final four manuscripts. According to Lightfoot, o, f, and p have no independent value, since they all derive directly or indirectly from v, which comes from the eleventh century.<sup>45</sup> This witness of v-o-f-p is slightly superior to the other four manuscripts.<sup>46</sup> Prostmeier has added another manuscript to the discussion: *Cod. Vaticanus gr. 1655*.<sup>47</sup> It also is a descendant of v, and "ist er bestenfalls für die genauere Erstellung einer Textgeschichte des Polykarpbriefs, nicht aber für die Textkritik von Bedeutung."<sup>48</sup> All nine Greek manuscripts of *Phil* end with the

---

<sup>43</sup> Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle."

<sup>44</sup> If Ussher's so-called *Salmasianus* is not the same as *Casanatensis*, then ten manuscripts have been used (see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 316–320; Bihlmeyer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, xxxix–xl; Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 13). For a longer discussion of many of the Greek and Latin manuscripts mentioned in this section, see T. Zahn, *Ignatii et Polycarpi epistolae martyria fragmenta* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1876), xiii–xxi; Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 13–18. See also F. R. Prostmeier, "Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung des Polykarp- und des Barnabasbriefes: Zwei nicht beachtete Deszendenten des Cod. Vat. Gr. 859," *Vigiliae Christianae* 48 (1994): 48–64.

<sup>45</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 317. See also Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, vol. 1, xcvi, who would add Codex Andrius (reported in 1883) to this list. O, f, and p themselves are from the sixteenth century (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 14).

<sup>46</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 317.

<sup>47</sup> Prostmeier, "Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung."

<sup>48</sup> Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 15.

words καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπο in 9.2 and immediately transfer without break to τὸν λαὸν τὸν καινὸν κ.τ.λ. of the *Epistle of Barnabas* 5.7 and following. This proves that all nine manuscripts share a common archetype.<sup>49</sup>

Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* III.36.13–15 does contain the Greek text of *Phil* 9 in its entirety and all of chapter 13 except the last sentence. Eusebius begins his second citation with καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς λέγει, which regularly introduces a quotation from the same work.<sup>50</sup> Portions of chapter 12 are preserved in Syriac in Timotheus (A.D. 457) and Severus (c. A.D. 515).

For the remaining text of *Phil* (chapters 10, 11, 14, most of 12, and the last line of 13), one must turn to the Latin version.<sup>51</sup> This Latin text is always included within the Long Recension of the Ignatian corpus (usually including the *Acts of Martyrdom*, *Prayer of Hero*, and the *Correspondence with the Virgin* as well), and therefore probably stems from a translation of a Greek volume which contained the Ignatian and pseudo-Ignatian epistles. The Latin manuscripts include the following: *Reginensis* 81 (r), *Trecensis* 412 (t), *Parisiensis* 1639 <formerly known as *Colbertinus* 1039> (c), *Bruxellensis* 5510 (b), *Oxoniae Balliolensis* 229 (o), *Palatinus* 150 (p), *Florentinus Laurentianus* xxiii.20 (f), *Vindobonensis* 1068 (v), and *Oxoniae Magdalensis* 78 (m). Latin v places *Phil* before the Ignatian collection; all the others place it subsequently. According to Lightfoot, two other Brussels manuscripts closely resemble *Bruxellensis* 5510 (*Bruxellensis* 703 and *Bruxellensis* 20132).<sup>52</sup> Lightfoot was able to obtain knowledge of three other manuscripts (*Carolopolitanus* 173, *Carolopolitanus* 266, and *Atrebatensis* 51) only through a printed catalog.<sup>53</sup>

Stapulensis published the first printed Latin text of *Phil* in 1498 in his edition of the Long Recension of Ignatius. Halloix published the earliest printed Greek text in 1633, followed by Ussher in 1644.<sup>54</sup> Ussher's text appears to transcribe Halloix (with corrections), and their source seems to have come from the Greek

---

<sup>49</sup> Perhaps the original merging of texts occurred through the disappearance of intervening pages (Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 200).

<sup>50</sup> This fact argues that, at least by Eusebius' time, *Phil* was extant as a single document.

<sup>51</sup> Zahn (whose text was followed by Funk) and Lightfoot tried to restore the Greek text; see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 320.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 318.

<sup>53</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 131.

<sup>54</sup> P. Halloix, *Illustrium ecclesiae orientalis scriptorum* (Douay: Bogardi, 1633), 525–532.

text family c-t-n.<sup>55</sup> Gebhardt simply identifies their text as c.<sup>56</sup> The published text remained virtually unchanged through the editions of Cotelier, Leclerc, Russel, and Le Moine. Routh added a few readings from Latin m in 1832. In 1838, Jacobson incorporated Greek f and p and Latin f into his text. Dressel added Greek v, o, c, and t and Latin p and r. Zahn (1876) followed by Funk (1878) incorporated Greek n to a limited degree (Zahn's text was already in type when he procured Greek n from Gebhardt, and Funk basically followed Zahn). Lightfoot added the remaining manuscripts. Neither Volkmar (1886) nor Hilgenfeld (1902) added new materials. The Funk-Bihlmeyer text employs all of the major available manuscripts except *Vaticanus gr. 1655*, which Prostmeier brought to scholarship's attention in 1994.<sup>57</sup>

The Latin translation came from an older form of the Greek than our extant manuscripts, but scholars have variously described it as "loose and paraphrastic,"<sup>58</sup> "somewhat carelessly made,"<sup>59</sup> "mangelhaft,"<sup>60</sup> "ungenau und nicht ohne Probleme,"<sup>61</sup> "recht ungenau und fehlerhaft,"<sup>62</sup> "assez libre et parfois inexacte."<sup>63</sup> For example, the Latin of 13.1 reads *deferat literas meas* for the Greek ὑμῶν ἀποκομίσῃ γράμματα, obviously misreading the ὑμῶν as ἡμῶν. In a reverse mistake, the Latin of 13.2 reads *quae transmissae sunt vobis* for the Greek τὰς πεμφθείσας ἡμῖν, misreading the ἡμῖν as ὑμῖν. The issue of the loose Latin translation will resurface in chapter 10 when we examine the issue of unity.

### Authenticity of *Philippians*

We have seen that both the Greek and Latin manuscripts of *Phil* are closely associated with the Long Recension of the Ignatian corpus. This fact alone would

---

<sup>55</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 319.

<sup>56</sup> Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn, *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, I.2, xxii.

<sup>57</sup> Prostmeier, "Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung."

<sup>58</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 317.

<sup>59</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 74.

<sup>60</sup> Meinhold, "Polykarpos," 1682.

<sup>61</sup> A. Lindemann and H. Paulsen, eds. *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 242.

<sup>62</sup> Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 111.

<sup>63</sup> Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 201.

seem to cast doubt upon the authenticity of *Phil*.<sup>64</sup> Lightfoot counters that the internal evidence (especially the allusive nature of the references to the Ignatian Epistles) decisively favors *Phil*'s genuineness.<sup>65</sup> Of course, various others have not agreed.

Historically, the authenticity of *Phil* has been inescapably tied to the authenticity of the Ignatian corpus. *Phil* provides a powerful early witness to Ignatius and his correspondence. Polycarp alludes to Ignatius and his companions in 1.1; explicitly names Ignatius in 9.1; refers to Ignatius' request to send a messenger to Antioch in 13.1; and mentions an Ignatian collection in 13.2. Those who deny the authenticity of the Middle Recension of the Ignatian correspondence are forced to deny the authenticity of *Phil* as a whole or in part. Yet, "The burden of proof for such radical surgery would seem to rest on those who practice it."<sup>66</sup>

Past scholars who considered *Phil* to be completely spurious have included Schwegler and Hilgenfeld.<sup>67</sup> But the external testimony to the authenticity of *Phil* is unquestionably strong. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Irenaeus explicitly referred to the epistle, Eusebius noted that it was still extant and quoted parts, and Jerome affirmed that it was still read in public assemblies in Asia Minor in his own day. The *Life of Polycarp* also demonstrates a knowledge of *Phil*. Timotheus, Severus, and the other Syriac fragments are additional important testimonies, though they are relatively late. Those who contend that the entirety of our *Phil* is a forgery fight an uphill battle.

Furthermore, the internal evidence is also forceful. The epistle betrays no motive for forgery. Harnack wrote,

There is no trace of any tendency beyond the immediate purpose of maintaining the true Christian life in the church and warning against covetousness and against an unbrotherly spirit. . . . In these circumstances it would never have occurred to any one to doubt the genuineness of the epistle or to suppose that it had been interpolated, but for the fact that in several passages reference is made to Ignatius and his epistles.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 318.

<sup>65</sup> For a full discussion of the genuineness of the epistle, see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 578–603.

<sup>66</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp's Witness," 1.

<sup>67</sup> Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, vol. 2, 154; Hilgenfeld, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 272.

<sup>68</sup> English translation in Andrews, "Polycarp."

It might be maintained that the entire epistle was forged to serve as a cover for a counterfeit Ignatian collection. But Lightfoot has examined the differences in ecclesiastical structure, doctrinal emphases, scriptural quotations, and individual expressions between the Polycarpian and Ignatian materials.<sup>69</sup>

Wake states of *Phil*'s genuineness, "In short, if it be lawful to doubt this, there will be no monument of antiquity left which we may not as well call in question, and reject as spurious."<sup>70</sup> Lightfoot agrees that "unless we are required to apply a wholly different standard of evidence here from that which is held satisfactory in other cases, we approach this Epistle with a very strong guarantee of its authenticity."<sup>71</sup>

However, the view that a basically authentic *Phil* includes interpolations is more credible.<sup>72</sup> Past interpreters who have posited interpolations have included Ritschl and Lipsius.<sup>73</sup> The classic representation of this opinion holds that all allusions and references to Ignatius are later additions (1.1; 9.1; all of chap. 13). Joly's modified version holds that a real (albeit obscure and otherwise unknown) Smyrnaean Ignatius was mentioned by Polycarp in 9.1.<sup>74</sup> The interpolator responsible for the amalgamation with the Antiochene Ignatius used this reference as a springboard upon which to build chapter 13 as a forged cover letter for a forged Ignatian corpus; he then proceeded to insert the allusion in 1.1 to complete his scheme.

Besides assumptions concerning the Ignatian corpus, there are textual problems in Polycarp's epistle that support such claims. The companions mentioned in *Phil* 9 are not found in the Ignatian correspondence. Chapter 9 seems to describe Ignatius as having passed away, while chapter 13 seems to imply that he is still living. There is also a grammatical inconsistency in *Phil* 1. We will discuss these problems in chapters 5, 7, and 10 of the present study.

<sup>69</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 594–599.

<sup>70</sup> Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 85.

<sup>71</sup> Lightfoot, *Essays*, 105.

<sup>72</sup> The examples which follow all pertain to the Ignatian question. Steinmetz has commented that the last sentence of *Phil* 5.3 may be an interpolation, since it interrupts the flow of the letter (Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 71). But it may be merely an afterthought. None of the alleged interpolations are absent from any of the manuscripts.

<sup>73</sup> Ritschl, *Die Entstehung*, 584; Lipsius, *Über das Verhältnis*, 14.

<sup>74</sup> Joly, *Le dossier*. Donaldson had already argued along similar lines (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 228).

But Lightfoot demonstrated that such “interpolations” do not interrupt *Phil*’s sequence of content; rather, their absence would disjoin the flow of thought. He also showed that supposed interpolations manifest the same style and character as the other material, “a stubborn fact which testifies to the identity of authorship.”<sup>75</sup> In the final analysis, the discussion of interpolations in *Phil* has often rested primarily upon a preconceived belief in the inauthenticity of the Ignatian letters.

### Summary of Contents

The letter opening of *Phil* rejoices in the Philippians’ hospitality toward Ignatius and his companions and praises the church’s faith. Chapter 2 serves as an introductory exhortation to avoid avarice and to be forgiving. Chapter 3 introduces the theme of “righteousness.” Chapters 4–6 list the necessary virtues of wives, widows, deacons, younger men, virgins, and elders. Chapter 7 warns against heretical infiltration. Chapters 8–10 admonish the readers to endure by following the examples of Jesus and various Christian figures. Chapter 11 broaches the situation of the fall of Valens, a Philippian elder. Chapter 12 demands a response of forgiveness. Chapter 13 refers to the Philippian requests to forward their commendation letter to Antioch and to send copies of Ignatius’ epistles. Chapter 14 concludes with a commendation of Crescens and his sister.<sup>76</sup>

Bauer considers the key words of the letter to be ἀπέχεσθαι (Latin *abstinere*) (2.2; 5.3; 6.1, 3; 11.1–2), ἀπολείπειν (2.1; 7.2), χαλιναγωγεῖν (5.3), ἀνακόπτεσθαι (5.3) and σωφρονεῖν (4.3). All of these words are ethical terms, and most of them concern the act of distancing oneself from evil (with the exception of σωφρονεῖν, which probably does not belong in a key word list anyway). I would add (and stress even more so) the terms δικαιοσύνη, φιλαργυρία (Latin *avaritia*), ἀφιέναι, and ὑπομονή (see my chapter 9).

Donaldson provides a helpful summary of the theology of Polycarp.<sup>77</sup> More specifically, Steinmetz claims that Polycarp emphasizes ethics to the near

---

<sup>75</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 601.

<sup>76</sup> Helpful summaries of *Phil* are found in Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 232ff; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 315–316; and Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 197ff.

<sup>77</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 234–245.

exclusion of eschatology.<sup>78</sup> The indicative is swallowed up by the imperative.<sup>79</sup> Marshall notes that *Phil*'s value lies (1) "in its picture of a congregation in the first half of the second century and of the doctrine believed in Polycarp's day"; (2) "in its supporting evidence concerning the works of Ignatius"; and (3) "in its quotations and allusions which bear witness to the early existence and authority of the books that make up the Christian Scriptures."<sup>80</sup> I would stress once again, however, the importance of a complete analysis of *Phil* for its own sake before moving on to the "value" it holds in tangential discussions. Having examined the author, the geographical and ecclesiastical contexts, the text, and the contents, I now turn to such important foundational investigations.

---

<sup>78</sup> See also H. Lohmann, *Drohung und Verheißung: Exegetische Untersuchungen zur Eschatologie bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), 177–194.

<sup>79</sup> Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 63–75.

<sup>80</sup> M. M. Marshall, Jr. "The Use of the Books of the New Testament by the Early Christian Writers, Clement of Rome, Polycarp of Smyrna and Irenaeus of Lyons" (M.A. thesis, Eastern New Mexico University, 1950), 39.



## Chapter 5

### The Background of *Philippians*

Because the Ignatian problem and New Testament questions have dominated Polycarpian studies, few scholars have attempted to interpret Polycarp's work for its own sake.<sup>1</sup> Most have raised considerations secondary to *Phil* first and then have fit a general interpretation of the letter into these considerations. This methodological flaw may alter any investigation into the topic. I propose to understand Polycarp's letter for its own sake first, and then to turn to the related issues. Of course, the difficulty concerns the shortage of material, but a general background of the epistle can be reconstructed based upon the available evidence.<sup>2</sup>

As Lightfoot noted, "This epistle is intimately connected with the letters and martyrdom of Ignatius himself."<sup>3</sup> Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch, had been arrested in Syria and was being deported to Rome. He passed through Smyrna on this journey toward martyrdom and met Polycarp there. Afterward, he continued on his way and passed through Philippi. It is generally assumed that he was indeed put to death in Rome, sometime between A.D. 108 and 117, since

---

<sup>1</sup> " . . . ist es sicherlich auch zu erklären, daß der Brief bisher fast nur in bezug auf Einleitungsfragen untersucht worden ist" (Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik," 241).

<sup>2</sup> A further complication arises in attempting to avoid the vicious circle involved in reconstructing the background of the letter based upon the text which is itself interpreted based upon the background. "Denn außer dem Brief besitzen wir kein Dokument, das den Anlaß des Briefes kenntlich machen könnte; er muß demnach aus dem Brief selbst ermittelt werden. Dabei setzt man sich aber der Gefahr des Zirkelschlusses aus" (Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 64). "If, however, researchers can show through the comparative study of Greco-Roman letters that a New Testament letter follows or adapts certain conventions, is a certain type, or functions in a certain way, then the researcher has introduced an outside control over that vicious circle" (S. K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 25). The discussion of the background of *Phil* in this chapter is based upon the clear paraenetic nature of the letter (see my chapters 7 and 8), the explicit theme of righteousness (see my chapter 9), and various external evidences.

<sup>3</sup> Lightfoot, *Essays*, 313.

Eusebius places his martyrdom late in Trajan's reign. This series of events may perhaps lead to some misunderstandings.

## History vs. Effectual History

The first danger we must avoid is a confusion of actual history with effectual history. Because an entire Ignatian corpus is extant and has wielded great influence, it is easy to suppose that Ignatius was a more prestigious Christian leader than Polycarp<sup>4</sup> and that Ignatius' passing through Smyrna was the occasion of Polycarp's change of fortune. In actuality, it seems that Ignatius' own fortunes changed during his sojourn in Asia Minor.

Harrison has cogently argued that the lack of "peace" which Ignatius refers to in his see of Antioch (*Philadelphians* 10; *Smyrnaeans* 11) does not refer to external persecution, but rather to internal strife.<sup>5</sup> Corwin concludes that it is "difficult" to understand Ignatius' "complex sense of both failure and authority" unless there had been internal dissension within the Antiochene church.<sup>6</sup> Genouillac asserts that there was a combination of internal strife resulting in

---

<sup>4</sup> Certainly, Ignatius could counsel Polycarp, telling him to be more diligent, for instance (*Polycarp* 3.2). At the same time, however, Ignatius rhetorically hoped that he would be found as Polycarp's disciple in the resurrection (*Polycarp* 7.1).

<sup>5</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 81–106. One may summarize his reasons: (1) the use of εἰρηνεύειν in early Christian literature; (2) the other words in the context of *Smyrnaeans* 12 (μέγεθος, σωματεῖον, εὐδία, λιμήν); (3) the lack of corroborating evidence substantiating persecution in Antioch; (4) Ignatius' expectation that other congregations would congratulate the Antiochene assembly; (5) the event seems more momentous than the cessation of persecution; (6) the internal discord explains some implicit references, the use of 1 Corinthians, Ignatius' self-deprecation, and his desire for martyrdom; (7) the rapid regathering of the church body. Though Schoedel criticized this view in his 1967 commentary on Polycarp (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 37), he adopted it in his 1985 commentary on Ignatius (W. R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 10–11; cf. Cadoux *Ancient Smyrna*, 330, 334, n. 2); see also F. W. Schlatter, "The Restoration of Peace in Ignatius' Antioch," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 35 (1984): 465–469. Headlam continued to maintain that the peace was a cessation of persecution (A. C. Headlam, "The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians," *Church Quarterly Review* 141 (1945): 12–13).

<sup>6</sup> Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 25; cf. *ibid.*, 28.

public disturbance which caused the secular authorities to step in.<sup>7</sup> When Ignatius left Antioch, he did not have control of his own church. For this reason, Ignatius believed his trip to Rome and eventual martyrdom was so crucial: it was a means of reestablishing his authority.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, Ignatius was overjoyed when he learned that peace had been restored to his church, and that it had re-acquired its former greatness (*Smyrnaeans* 11). "Thus the 'peace' that was restored in Antioch is taken to refer to a resolution of problems in Antioch that favored Ignatius' cause."<sup>9</sup>

Outside of Antioch, Ignatius' fortunes began to change as he traveled through Asia Minor and on to Greece. Perhaps this was not incidental: "Not so obvious are the indications that the spontaneity of the recognition and support accorded the martyr depended in part on careful planning by Ignatius or his friends."<sup>10</sup> Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, played no small part in these affairs: "Polycarp was evidently stirred by the intense spirituality of his visitor from Antioch and proved to be his most enthusiastic advocate."<sup>11</sup> Polycarp's Smyranean congregation served as the meeting place of Ignatius with delegates from Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles. Polycarp assisted in the sending of Burrhus as a companion (*Smyrnaeans* 12.1), and he may have even stimulated Ignatius to write his epistles.<sup>12</sup> Ignatius spoke openly of his love for Polycarp (*Ephesians* 21.1) and of

<sup>7</sup> H. de Genouillac, *L'église chrétienne au temps de saint Ignace d'Antioche* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1907), 203.

<sup>8</sup> Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 10–14. Philo and Rheus Agathopous continued to serve as Ignatius' liaisons with Antioch (*Philadelphians* 11.1; *Smyrnaeans* 10.1).

<sup>9</sup> Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 10. Harrison (following Streeter) uses a "provisional hypothesis" that this turn of events was occasioned by the unification under a new bishop (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 82–83, 90). His further supposition that this new bishop was the author of the Gospel of John moves from "provisional" to fanciful (*ibid.*, 104). Cf. R. M. Grant, "Jewish Christianity at Antioch in the Second Century," *Recherches de sciences religieuses* 60 (1972): 101.

<sup>10</sup> Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 12. Specifically, this is seen in the original sending of messengers to Rome (*Romans* 10.2), the sending of the Roman epistle from Smyrna (*Romans* 10.1), the alerting of the Ephesian, Magnesians, and Trallian churches of Ignatius' arrival in Smyrna, the sending of church leaders to accompany Ignatius on his journey (*Ephesians* 2.1; *Smyrnaeans* 12.1), and the request for various churches to send letters to Antioch (*Philadelphians* 10; *Smyrnaeans* 11.2–3; *Polycarp* 8.1; *Phil* 13.1).

<sup>11</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp, Epistle of."

<sup>12</sup> Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 13–14.

the comfort Polycarp bestowed upon him in Smyrna (*Magnesians* 15). Ignatius would later address Polycarp directly, “Welcoming your godly mind which is fixed as if on immovable rock, I glory exceedingly that it was granted me to see your blameless face wherein I would fain have pleasure in God” (*Polycarp* 1.1).

When Ignatius reached Smyrna and Polycarp embraced his cause, affairs changed. Polycarp was already a well-respected Christian leader in Asia Minor and his support bolstered Ignatius’ attitude and his objective. In a sense, Ignatius’ excursion through Smyrna did not greatly change Polycarp’s life history at that time, though it greatly changed his effectual history in subsequent scholarship. Since Ignatius’ letters remained extant and wielded great influence, Polycarp became known for his attachment to the situation: “The importance of the letter <Phil> is enhanced by the fact that Polycarp’s career intersected that of others who left a deeper impression on the early Church than Polycarp himself.”<sup>13</sup> But the real change occurred in Ignatius’ life; and Ignatius’ effectual history was cemented as well.<sup>14</sup> Polycarp put together a collection of Ignatian letters by which Ignatius’ future reputation was guaranteed. The order of the genuine collection (*Smyrnaeans*, *Polycarp*, *Ephesians*, *Magnesians*, *Philadelphians*, *Trallians*, and *Romans*) reflects the order in *Phil* 13.2: “We send you, as you asked, the letters which were sent to us by him <*Smyrnaeans* and *Polycarp*> and such others as we had in our possession <*Ephesians*, *Magnesians*, *Philadelphians*, *Trallians*, and perhaps *Romans*>.”<sup>15</sup>

We must remember that the amount of extant material does not necessarily correspond to the greatness of the individual. In fact, the Ignatian corpus is extant probably because of Polycarp’s own collection endeavors. “The significance of Polycarp in the history of the Church is out of all proportion to our knowledge of the facts of his career.”<sup>16</sup> His visit to Anicetus in Rome reveals that Polycarp was

---

<sup>13</sup> Schoedel, “Polycarp, Epistle of.”

<sup>14</sup> Grant states, “The letters of the bishop of Antioch were given an *imprimatur* – though quite an unofficial one – by the bishop of Smyrna” (Grant, *Formation*, 23). Certainly Polycarp cast his reputational weight upon the Ignatian letters, but the connotation of an “unofficial” *imprimatur* may be anachronistically confusing.

<sup>15</sup> Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 18. Polycarp’s Ignatian collection is the basis of our Middle Recension, the same letters Eusebius lists (*Historia ecclesiastica* III.36) (see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 423–230). On the question whether or not Polycarp possessed a copy of *Romans*, see the discussion below.

<sup>16</sup> Andrews, “Polycarp.”

“die anerkannte kirchliche Autorität in Kleinasien.”<sup>17</sup> Certainly by the end of his life, his reputation was firmly established: The *Martyrdom* portrays the hostile executing throng as shouting, “This is the teacher of Asia. This is the father of the Christians. This is the destroyer of our gods. This is the man who has taught so many no longer to sacrifice and no longer to pray to the gods” (*Martyrdom* 12.2). Polycrates labeled him “one of the great luminaries (μεγάλα στοιχεία)” of his time (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.24–25). Jerome identified him as the *princeps asiae* (*De viris illustribus* 17). By the end of his life, Polycarp had proven that he was “doubtlessly the most significant ecclesiastical leader of the first half of II CE.”<sup>18</sup> But Eusebius recognizes that Polycarp had already achieved a level of “eminence” in Ignatius’ day (*Historia ecclesiastica* III.36).<sup>19</sup>

### Contact Between Polycarp and the Philippians

The second misconception we must expose is the belief that the Philippians were first introduced to Polycarp through Ignatius’ sojourn and that they initiated the correspondence with Polycarp at this juncture. If Polycarp was already a well-known figure in Asia Minor, and if Christians traveled between churches more often than commonly realized (as current scholarship reveals),<sup>20</sup> then we may suppose that the Philippians had known of (and respected) Polycarp.<sup>21</sup> The very paraenetic nature of *Phil* implies some relationship between Polycarp and the Philippians.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1668.

<sup>18</sup> Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 308.

<sup>19</sup> This may perhaps be due to his apostolic connection (see Lightfoot, *Essays*, 89).

<sup>20</sup> For example, see J. M. Lieu, *The Second and Third Epistles of John: History and Background* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1986), 125–135.

<sup>21</sup> See Weidmann, *Polycarp and John*, 4. Harrison, who of course dates *Phil* 1–12 to A.D. 135, states, “In their sore straits they had written to Polycarp as the most respected leader of the Church in that part of the world, begging him to intervene” (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 129). The *Life of Polycarp*, though probably a much later work, recognized the fact that Polycarp would have naturally been consulted for advice in various situations (*Life* 7, 21).

<sup>22</sup> L. G. Perdue, “The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature,” *Semeia* 50 (1990): 14–16.

Chapter 14 (extant only in the Latin translation) contains an intriguing reference: “*Haec vobis scripsi per Crescentem, quem in praesenti commendavi vobis et nunc commendo. Conversatus est enim nobiscum inculpabiliter; credo quia et vobiscum similiter. Sororem autem eius habebitis commendatam, cum venerit ad vos.*” The problem involves the phrase *in praesenti*. If the Latin were correct, we would read,

I have written this to you by Crescens, whom I commended to you *now*, and now commend again. For he has behaved blamelessly among us, and I believe that he will do the same with you. His sister shall be commended to you when she comes to you.

Of course, such a rendering is meaningless, and interpreters have offered various suggestions. (1) Bauer, followed by Lake and Harrison, argued that the phrase actually had something to do with Polycarp being “present” earlier in Philippi (cf. 11:3).<sup>23</sup> (2) Harrison suggested that the Latin, instead of being *in praesenti*, may have been *praesentem olim* (from the Greek παρόντα ἄρτι)<sup>24</sup>: “I have written these things to you by the hand of Crescens whom I commended to you once before in his presence, and now commend (to you again).”<sup>25</sup> Such a reconstruction remains speculative.<sup>26</sup> (3) Zahn maintained that the Latin *in praesenti* was an unfortunate translation of the Greek εἰς τὸ παρόν: “I have written this to you by Crescens, whom I commended to you *until the present* <i.e., at every opportunity>, and now commend again.”<sup>27</sup> Most scholars have found this reconstruction to be forced. (4) Lightfoot argued that *in praesenti* was a poor Latin rendering of ἄρτι: I have written this to you by Crescens, whom I commended to you *just now*, and now commend again.”<sup>28</sup> There are parallel examples of ἄρτι contrasted with νῦν in Plato (*Alcibiades* 130E; *Meno* 89C). (5) Schoedel argued that someone missed three letters of an original Greek ENTOIIAPEΛΘONTI (“in the past”) and read ENTOIPAPONTI (“in the present”):

---

<sup>23</sup> Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 298. Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 301: “I have written to you by Crescens, whom I commended to you when I was present, and now commend again.”

<sup>24</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 328.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 320.

<sup>26</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 41.

<sup>27</sup> Zahn, *Ignatii et Polycarpi*, 130–131.

<sup>28</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 349–350.

"I have written this to you by Crescens, whom I commended to you *in the past* and commend now again."<sup>29</sup>

Schoedel's rendering would help interpret the next phrase: *Conversatus est enim nobiscum inculpabiliter; credo quia et vobiscum similiter*. The question is, did Polycarp mean, "For he has behaved blamelessly among us, and I believe that he will do so also with you" or "For he has behaved blamelessly among us, and I believe that he did so also among you"? Schoedel's rendering of *in praesenti* lends credence to the second translation. Finally, *Phil* 14 seems to draw a contrast between Crescens, who was commended in the past, and his sister, who will soon arrive. The whole paragraph would then read:

I have written this to you by Crescens, whom I commended to you in the past and now commend again. For he has walked blamelessly among us and I believe that he did so also among you. And you may consider his sister recommended when she comes to you.<sup>30</sup>

Whatever reconstruction above one accepts, this passage infers that Polycarp had previous interaction with the Philippian church.<sup>31</sup> For this reason, Barnard, Glimm, Camelot, and others argued (against Harrison's original inclinations) that chapter 14 better fits into the second letter of a two-letter hypothesis. Thus, chapter 14, as part of the second letter, refers back to the original cover letter (chapter 13). In my chapter 10, I will demonstrate the weaknesses of the two-letter hypothesis, however. If the unity of the letter is accepted, this recommendation of Crescens merely proves that Polycarp had previous communications with the Philippians and that Ignatius' journey through Macedonia was not their first introduction to the Smyrnaean leader. If so, they probably already respected Polycarp and coveted his counsel.<sup>32</sup> Ignatius' sojourn and testimony only confirmed their deep admiration for this "external" leader, and

---

<sup>29</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 41. For uses of τὸ παρελθόν in the sense of "the past," see Aristotle, *Physics* 218a 9 and Basil, *Address to Young Men* 10. For an example of prior and present recommendation, cf. *P. Oxy.* 32 (Latin): "I have recommended my friend Theon to you before, and now I ask you, lord, to look upon him as if he were myself (English translation in Stowers, *Letter-Writing*, 157).

<sup>30</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 41.

<sup>31</sup> Bauer's reconstruction of 11.3 would actually refer to a previous visit by Polycarp to Philippi, but it is not well accepted (see Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 32).

<sup>32</sup> According to Grant's reconstruction, Polycarp wrote the Philippians *first*, then they wrote back, and finally he responded with *Phil*. This reconstruction depends upon Grant's interpretation of ἐμπροσθεν in Ignatius, *Polycarp* 8.1 (see below) (Grant, *Formation*, 23).

they asked for his advice concerning a specific situation. "The authority that Polycarp exercised beyond the Smyrnaean Christian community can be judged by the task that he was asked to assume by the Philippians."<sup>33</sup> Schoedel asserts that this is an example of the "informal authority" of "prestigious outsiders who could be trusted to give an unbiased judgment."<sup>34</sup>

I would stress, however, that although the Philippians and Polycarp had had previous contact with each other, they were not necessarily exceptionally close. Lightfoot notes that "there is not much of personal matter" in *Phil.*<sup>35</sup> The lack of personal greetings in the letter closing is especially pertinent.

### The Request to Forward the Philippians' Letter

This brings us to a third observation. When the Philippians wrote Polycarp, because he was respected by them apart from Ignatius' visit, they requested more than material concerning Ignatius. It is negligent to suppose that the Philippians could only have had one request in mind per letter, and therefore we must separate differing issues into separate letters.<sup>36</sup>

It seems that the Philippians had written Polycarp with several requests: (1) They asked that Polycarp send their letter of congratulations on to Syria (13.1). (2) They requested a copy of Polycarp's collection of Ignatian letters (13.1). (3) And they sought advice "concerning righteousness" (3.1), which I will interpret within the context caused by Valens' actions.<sup>37</sup>

Let us consider the three requests more fully. The first two surround the Ignatian journey. Ignatius had traveled through Smyrna and on to Troas. From there he sailed to Neapolis and Philippi. The Philippians had entertained Ignatius, Zosimus, and Rufus (*Phil* 1.1; 9.1). Zahn conjectures that Zosimus and Rufus were two Bithynian Christians sent by Pliny to Rome and united to the Ignatian

---

<sup>33</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp, Epistle of."

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. *1 Clement*.

<sup>35</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 165–166.

<sup>36</sup> Contra Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 166.

<sup>37</sup> Surprisingly, Lake does not even mention the Valens problem when he discusses the object of the letter. He mentions only Polycarp's warning against apostasy and his sending of the Ignatian letters (Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 280).



party in Philippi.<sup>38</sup> All three prisoners would then be under the escort of the “ten leopards” (Ignatius, *Romans* 5). Such a hypothesis remains conjecture; what is certain is that Zosimus and Rufus are not mentioned in the Ignatian corpus.<sup>39</sup>

The first two occasions of *Phil* directly relate to this Ignatian journey. First, they wanted Polycarp to deliver their letter of congratulations to Syria: “You wrote me, both you and Ignatius, that if anyone was going to Syria, he should also take your letter. I will do this if I have convenient opportunity, either myself or one whom I send as a representative (and yours also)” (13.1).

We gather that both the Philippians and Ignatius had requested Polycarp to forward their letter. Undoubtedly, their request accompanied their correspondence. But when did Ignatius make this petition? Though Harrison argues that Ignatius wrote Polycarp a second time, asking him to deliver the Philippian correspondence specifically,<sup>40</sup> such a hypothesis may be unnecessary. Kleist suggests that the phrase may mean “You write, as also Ignatius has written,” that is to the Philadelphians (10.1), the Smyrnaeans (11.2), and Polycarp personally (7.2).<sup>41</sup> Kleist’s translation is awkward, but his meaning points in the right direction. Ignatius had generally requested Polycarp in his letter to him: “You ought, O Polycarp, most blessed of God, to summon a godly council, and elect someone who is very dear to you and is zealous, who can be called God’s courier; appoint him to go to Syria to glorify your zealous love to the glory of God” (*Polycarp* 7.2; English translation in *LCL*). He later added,

Since I could not write to all the Churches because of my sudden sailing from Troas to Neapolis as the will of God enjoins, you shall write as one possessing the mind of God to the Churches on the road in front of me, that they also shall treat me in the same way (let those who can send messengers, and the others send letters through those whom you send, that you may be glorified by a memorable deed), as is worthy of you (8.2; English translation in *LCL*).<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Zahn, *Ignatii et Polycarpi*, 125. Cf. Pliny, *Epistles*, X.96.4 Lightfoot calls this “a not improbable conjecture” (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 313). Both names have been found on various inscriptions in Macedonia; Zosimus, Rufus, and Valens appear together on one Philippian inscription (*ibid.*, 337).

<sup>39</sup> Perhaps Polycarp learned of these individuals from the Philippian correspondence he had received.

<sup>40</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 79, 112; Zahn argues for a specific Ignatian request as well (Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 290; cf. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 339).

<sup>41</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 185 n.1

<sup>42</sup> Similar instructions are given to the church of Philadelphia in *Philadelphians* 10.1–2.

Schoedel is probably right in assuming that Polycarp gleaned a “particular application” concerning the Philippians from these “general admonitions.”<sup>43</sup>

According to these instructions, Ignatius’ plan was for Polycarp to (1) summon a council to appoint a messenger to Syria and (2) to encourage other churches to send messengers or letters along. He wrote the Smyrnaean church as a whole, “Your Church ought to appoint for the honor of God a delegate of God to go to Syria, and congratulate them that they have gained peace, and have recovered their proper greatness, and that their proper constitution has been restored” (*Smyrnaeans* 11.2; English translation in *LCL*). This delegate was to bring a letter of congratulations (11.2). Along these lines, Ignatius encouraged the Philadelphians,

It is proper for you, as a Church of God, to appoint a deacon to go as the ambassador of God to it <the church in Antioch>, to congratulate those who are gathered together, and to glorify the Name . . . even as the neighboring Churches have sent bishops, and others presbyters and deacons (*Philadelphians* 10.1–2; English translation in *LCL*).

Most likely, these congratulations were in order because the Antiochene church had successfully chosen a new bishop who won the approval of Ignatius.<sup>44</sup> This placement of the bishop may have occurred only after some rough times within the congregation.

Ignatius desired Polycarp to be the hub of this congratulatory mission. Because Ignatius was suddenly setting sail from Troas to Neapolis, he could not finish his intention of writing “to all the churches” and wanted Polycarp to write letters to “the churches before” (ταῖς ἔμπροσθεν ἐκκλησίαις) (*Polycarp* 8.1). What is meant by this peculiar phrase? Kleist argues that the adverb ἔμπροσθεν refers to “principal, chief,” but this does not seem to fit the context. Bauer maintains that Ignatius was referring to the churches before him (i.e., in

---

<sup>43</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 39. Lightfoot considered it possible that Ignatius had written other instructions no longer extant (“probably a few lines”), but seemed to side with Polycarp’s adaptation of Ignatius’ general instructions (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 347). For those who see ἔμπροσθεν as including European churches, Ignatius’ instructions would apply to the Philippians (see the discussion below). Although Ignatius merely requested that Polycarp send someone (*Polycarp* 8.2), Polycarp seems open to the possibility of journeying to Antioch himself.

<sup>44</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 82–83, 90; cf. Grant, “Jewish Christianity,” 101.

Macedonia, etc.);<sup>45</sup> Grant and Goodspeed agree: “He asked Polycarp to do this for him, so that his triumphal progress might continue all the way to the city of his martyrdom.”<sup>46</sup> Yet why would Ignatius’ hasty sailing from Troas to Neapolis prevent his correspondence with the Macedonian churches, since his destination was Macedonia itself? Grant and Goodspeed argue that Ignatius would no longer have had the amanuensis services of Burrhus.<sup>47</sup> The deacon Burrhus had been sent by the Ephesian church with the aid of the Smyrnaeans, and he had accompanied Ignatius all the way to Troas. Burrhus served Ignatius as a secretary (*Philadelphians* 11.2; *Smyrnaeans* 12). But it seems that he would have been the letter carrier who delivered the epistles to Philadelphia and Smyrna.<sup>48</sup> Therefore, after the departure from Troas, his services would no longer have been available, and the circumstances prohibited Ignatius from writing the letters himself.

Nevertheless, the adverb ἐμπροσθεν most likely refers to churches beyond Polycarp toward Antioch.<sup>49</sup> It is possible, of course, that Polycarp may have taken his assignment so seriously that he sent messengers to the Macedonian churches as well, and this is when he commended Crescens to the Philippians (*Phil* 14.1). In any case, the Philippians certainly requested Polycarp to send their congratulatory letter on to Antioch.

### The Request for Ignatius’ Letters

The second Philippian request was that Polycarp send them any Ignatian letters he had.

We send you, as you asked, the letters of Ignatius, which were sent to us by him, and others which we had by us. These are subjoined to this letter, and you will be able to benefit greatly from them. For they contain faith, patience, and all the edification which pertains to our Lord (*Phil* 13.2).

---

<sup>45</sup> Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 281. Schoedel labels this interpretation as “possible” (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 38). Cf. Lake’s translation: “the Churches on the road in front of me” (Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 277).

<sup>46</sup> Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 14. Cf. Grant, *Formation*, 23. See also Norris, “Ignatius,” 26.

<sup>47</sup> Grant and Goodspeed, *History*, 14, 16.

<sup>48</sup> Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 254. Cf. Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 17.

<sup>49</sup> Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 279–280.

The Greek construction clarifies that the Philippians had requested both Ignatius' letters written directly to Smyrna and any other of his letters Polycarp had available. They would have heard of these epistles from Ignatius himself or from those accompanying him.<sup>50</sup> They seem to have regarded Ignatius highly; undoubtedly his certain imminent martyrdom increased their admiration. Accordingly, they desired to peruse his thoughts in written form.

Letter collections were usually made after the author's death, though sometimes an author himself might compile a corpus.<sup>51</sup> Cadoux believes that Polycarp would have requested copies of *Ephesians*, *Magnesians*, *Trallians*, and *Romans* right after they were composed in Smyrna and before they were sent to their respective recipients.<sup>52</sup> Others believe that Polycarp only later collected the epistles; in this case, he would have been unable to secure a copy of *Romans*. Camelot argues that Polycarp's collection "ne contenait sans doute" the *Epistle to the Romans*.<sup>53</sup> Lake notes that *Romans* has had a different textual history than the other six letters of the Middle Recension.<sup>54</sup> However, the textual problems related to *Romans* may also arise because the letter is regularly included in the Antiochene Acts of Ignatius.<sup>55</sup> In any case, it is certain that Polycarp preserved the Ignatian letters (with the possible exception of *Romans*) for posterity.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 314; Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 122.

<sup>51</sup> S. K. Stowers, "Letters (Greek and Latin Letters)," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

<sup>52</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 329.

<sup>53</sup> Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 192, 223 n.3: "Il était facile à Polycarpe de réunir à Smyrne les lettres adressées aux autres églises d'Asie. On peut conjecturer que par conséquent ce premier recueil ne contenait pas la lettre aux Romains qui nous a été transmise indépendamment des autres." See also Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 110.

<sup>54</sup> Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 280–281; Corwin agrees with Lake's theory (Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 10); Cadoux of course believes Polycarp did have a copy, since he maintains that Polycarp collected the epistles prior to their forwarding (Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 327; cf. Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 19). For a fuller discussion of *Romans*' place in the collection, see O. Perler, Review of *Ignace d'Antioche*, by T. Camelot, in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 43 (1957), 357–358.

<sup>55</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 287.

<sup>56</sup> His letter-collecting actions may perhaps have been stimulated by a Pauline collection (E. J. Goodspeed, *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1927), 10, 36ff).

## The Request for Advice about “Righteousness”

Finally, the Philippians sought advice “concerning righteousness” (*Phil* 3.1).<sup>57</sup> In chapter 9, I will argue that this was a request for the practical, ethical response of “righteousness” to the problem of Valens. I will demonstrate that the term “righteousness” (δικαιοσύνη) occurs in contexts that can be interpreted consistently in this manner.

Though Valens is mentioned only once in *Phil*, an incident revolving around this character “has plainly made a deep impression on Polycarp.”<sup>58</sup> Valens<sup>59</sup> was once a presbyter among the Philippians (11.1).<sup>60</sup> However, due to the sin of greed (*avaritia*), he and his wife disgraced themselves (11.4). Donaldson argues that behind the Latin *avaritia* in chapter 11 was the Greek πλεονεξία, and that the original intent of the word was adultery, not greed.<sup>61</sup> But it seems difficult to explain how Valens *and his wife* could be jointly guilty of adultery, and greed (φιλαργυρία) is a constant theme throughout the epistle. Furthermore, in 2.2 πλεονεξία is translated as *concupiscentia*.<sup>62</sup> Polycarp’s stress on “truthfulness” in 11.1 suggests that Valens tried to hide his transgression; Lightfoot concludes that the couple were “the Ananias and Sapphira of the Philippian community.”<sup>63</sup>

*Phil* does not directly state what action this greed involved.<sup>64</sup> Harrison, Bauer, and Paulsen argue that the greed entailed Valens’ hoarding of his own wealth.<sup>65</sup> Lightfoot, Glimm, and Koester maintain that it involved stealing from the

<sup>57</sup> Harrison notes that the verb προκαλέω even infers a challenge (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 170).

<sup>58</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 314.

<sup>59</sup> Valens was a common name in Philippi; for inscriptional evidence, see Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 31.

<sup>60</sup> Nautin conjectures that he was probably even the bishop of Philippi, but this remains undemonstrable (Nautin, “Polycarp”). Cf. Kleist, *Didache*, 191 n. 46.

<sup>61</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolic Fathers*, 230; cf. Jacobson in Kleist, *Didache*, 194 n. 78.

<sup>62</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 31.

<sup>63</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 314.

<sup>64</sup> The accusation of avarice “was raised against many political, philosophical, and religious opponents at that time” (Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 303).

<sup>65</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 167; Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 123.

church's common fund.<sup>66</sup> The latter seems to be the better alternative,<sup>67</sup> because Polycarp implies that the Philippians were left "poor" (2.3), and he encourages them to continue their almsgiving (10.2).<sup>68</sup> The social chaos caused by Valens' sin seems to correspond to a theft from the common fund. Perhaps this fund was even set aside for the purpose of manumitting slaves.<sup>69</sup> In the end, "he was writing for those who knew only too well precisely what he meant, and he was not considering us."<sup>70</sup> Although this Valens incident is only mentioned by name once, it has greatly affected the entire composition of Polycarp's epistle, as witnessed by the repetitive references to avarice.<sup>71</sup> The result of the Valens incident was internal discord within the church and scandal in the community.<sup>72</sup>

## Summary

This investigation of the background of the epistle reveals that Polycarp was a trusted and well-respected church leader, that he had had previous contact with the Philippians, and that the Philippians had made several requests of this esteemed acquaintance. Just as several issues can be discussed in a letter with a friend, the Philippians placed their petitions in *one* letter.

The "epistolary situation" of a letter includes the relationship between sender and recipient, the current status of that relationship, and the occasion for composition.<sup>73</sup> This chapter has established that Polycarp and the Philippians had

---

<sup>66</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 341; Glimm, "Letter," 133; Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 306.

<sup>67</sup> Hermas condemns both forms of greed: *Visions* 3.9.4–10; *Similitudes* 9.26.2. Maier offers the "tentative appraisal" that *Phil* should be interpreted "in a social setting in which well-to-do presbyters continue to enjoy and secure prosperity by retaining socio-economic links within pagan society" (Maier, "Purity," 238).

<sup>68</sup> The latter passage leads into the introduction of Valens in *Phil* 11.

<sup>69</sup> J. A. Harrill, "Ignatius, *Ad Polycarp*. 4.3 and the Corporate Manumission of Christian Slaves," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1 (1993): 107–142. Revised as chapter 4 in idem, *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 158–192.

<sup>70</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 167. Harrison's further supposition that Valens tried to cover up his greed with feigned chastity seems baseless (ibid., 167–168).

<sup>71</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 166.

<sup>72</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 168.

<sup>73</sup> Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 53.

a previous (though not necessarily extremely close) relationship, and that the Ignatian journey had brought them back into contact with one another. The occasions for writing included the Philippian request for an Ignatian collection, the Philippian petition for the forwarding of their Antiochene letter, and the Philippian entreaty for advice (presumably the “righteous” response to the Valens situation).

## Chapter 6

### The Problem of Heresy in *Philippians*

Harrison argued that the background of *Phil* 1–12 centers around a “crisis” of heresy rather than Valens.<sup>1</sup> But, as Barnard notes, Harrison “overemphasizes the ‘crisis’ atmosphere” and underestimates the Valens problem.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, heresy is mentioned in *Phil* and was apparently worthy of warnings from Polycarp.

The two main passages concerning heretics in *Phil* are chapters 2 and 7. *Phil* 2 refers to the errors of an unnamed “many”:

Wherefore girding up your loins serve God in fear and truth, putting aside<sup>3</sup> empty vanity <vain discussion> and vulgar error <the error of the many>, believing on him who raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead and gave him glory, and a throne on his right hand, to whom all breath serves, who is coming as the Judge of the living and of the dead, whose blood God will require from them who disobey him.

In Jewish and Christian polemics, vanity and error are characteristics of pagan idolaters and heretics.<sup>4</sup> 1 Timothy 1:6 also refers to the “vain discussion” (μεταιολογία) of heretics. *Phil* 2 stresses the doctrines of resurrection and judgment against these opponents.

The other key passage is *Phil* 6.3–7.2. The text asserts:

Let us be zealous for good, refraining from offence, and from the false brethren, and from those who bear the name of the Lord in hypocrisy, who deceive empty-minded men. For everyone who does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is an anti-Christ; and whosoever does not confess the testimony of the Cross is of the devil: and whosoever shall pervert the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts and say that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, that man is the first-born of Satan. Wherefore, leaving the foolishness of the crowd,

---

<sup>1</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Letters*, 129, mentions both, but his emphasis is definitely on the fact that “Philippi had been invaded by False Teachers.”

<sup>2</sup> Barnard, “Problem,” 34, 38.

<sup>3</sup> Ἀπολείπω is an ambiguous verb; it may mean either “leave hold of (stop being involved with)” or “leave untouched (do not start being involved with).” In this passage, Kleist translates the participle as “leave untouched” (Kleist, *Didache*, 76).

<sup>4</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 11.



and their false teaching, let us turn back to the word which was delivered to us in the beginning, watching unto prayer and persevering in fasting, beseeching the all-seeing God in our supplications to lead us not into temptation, even as the Lord said, "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak."

From this passage, one gathers that the heretics in *Phil* deny that Jesus Christ came in the flesh, they deny the testimony of the cross,<sup>5</sup> they twist the words of the Lord to fit their own desires, and they deny the resurrection and future judgment.

### Irenaeus' Anecdote

Harrison argued that the main heretic opposed in *Phil* was Marcion, and he emphasized a correlation between the material in *Phil* and an anti-Marcionite anecdote in Irenaeus involving Polycarp (since both use the label "firstborn of Satan"). Marcion was a second-century heretical leader.<sup>6</sup> According to Tertullian, he was born in Sinope, but later relocated to Rome. When the Roman church excommunicated him in A.D. 144, it returned a large amount of money he had donated after amassing it as a wealthy shipowner. Marcion is noted for differentiating between the just Creator God of the Old Testament and the loving Father of Jesus Christ and for espousing his "limited canon": a collection of ten emended Pauline epistles and an edited Gospel of Luke.

---

<sup>5</sup> The construction may be an objective or subjective genitive (witness born to or by the cross). In view of the traditional nature of the section and its allusions to Johannine material (see discussion later in this chapter), 1 John 5:6–8 may argue for a subjective genitive (see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 334; Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche* 214 n.1).

<sup>6</sup> Harnack set the stage for the modern examination of Marcion (Harnack, *Marcion*). Naturally, later scholars, though indebted to Harnack, have also vigorously critiqued his work. Wilson discusses the predispositions of Harnack's liberal theology, his belief in a simple gospel of Jesus later adulterated with christological dogma, his inadequate view of first- and second-century Judaism, and his simplistic overemphasis upon the parallels between Paul, Marcion, and Luther (S. G. Wilson, "Marcion and the Jews," in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, vol. 2, *Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1986), 46–47). See also D. L. Balás, "Marcion Revisited: A 'Post-Harnack' Perspective," in *Texts and Testaments*, ed. W. E. March (San Antonio: Trinity University, 1980), 95–108.

Goodspeed, Campenhausen, and Knox have argued that the Pastoral epistles were written against Marcion, a view since frequently dismissed.<sup>7</sup> According to this theory, the ἀντιθέσις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως of 1 Timothy 6:20 refers to the *Antitheseis* of Marcion which contrasted the creator god of justice and the benevolent god.<sup>8</sup> However, the false teachers in 1 Timothy had a strong Jewish inclination (1 Tim. 1:7; Tit. 1:10, 14; 3:9). In addition, “any polemic against specific Marcionite views is completely missing”<sup>9</sup> in the Pastorals. Similarly, Barnikol contended that the Ignatian epistles were directed against Marcion; although Hoffmann concurs, this view lacks definite evidence.<sup>10</sup>

In *Adversus haereses* III.3, Irenaeus relates a story in which Polycarp met Marcion and called him “the first-born of Satan.” If Polycarp did indeed meet Marcion, as Irenaeus claims, did this meeting occur in Rome?<sup>11</sup> If so, Polycarp

---

<sup>7</sup> But cf. J. B. Tyson, “John Knox and the Acts of the Apostles,” in *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts*, ed. M. C. Parsons and J. B. Tyson (Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), 77. See also R. J. Hoffmann, *Marcion, on the Restitution of Christianity* (Chico: Scholars, 1984), 281–305.

<sup>8</sup> See W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed., trans. H. C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon, 1975), 379. Harrison regarded 1 Timothy 6:20 as a reference to Marcion, but followed Harnack in considering the verse to be a late addition (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 242–244). Although the *Antitheses* are no longer extant, many quotations are included in other works. Campenhausen is reticent of Harnack's attempt to reconstruct the work (see A. von Harnack, *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*, trans. J. E. Steely and L. D. Bierma (Durham: Labyrinth, 1990), 25–51). Campenhausen states, “Unfortunately, we can no longer form any picture of the structure and character of the Antitheses” (H. von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 161; cf. E. Muehlenberg, “Marcion's Jealous God,” in *Disciplina Nostra*, ed. D. F. Winslow (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979), 98–100).

<sup>9</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, 379.

<sup>10</sup> Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 61. See Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 268.

<sup>11</sup> Irenaeus himself is indefinite as to the time. He begins, “And Polycarp himself replied to Marcion, who met him on one occasion. . . .” (*Adversus haereses* III.3.4; English translation in *ANF*). But the Irenaeian context implies Rome (Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 37–39). In later tradition, Jerome placed the meeting in Rome, and Philostratus placed it in Asia Minor (Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 17; Philostratus, *Liber de haereses* 17.7). Blackman wavers between Smyrna and Philippi (E. C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948), 2, 56). See Bauer on the summoning of “Rome” to combat heresy (Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 111–129).

did not meet Marcion until around A.D. 155, when he visited Anicetus there.<sup>12</sup> But Cadoux places the meeting in Asia Minor.<sup>13</sup> He reasons, “Markion would hardly request recognition from Polykarp ten years after the Roman Church had excommunicated him.”<sup>14</sup> This argument seems to read too much history into Irenaeus and too little boldness into Marcion. While it is true that a Marcionite community was located in Smyrna around A.D. 250, it is impossible to trace its roots to the mid-second century.<sup>15</sup> We have no evidence that Marcion ever visited Smyrna and met Polycarp there.<sup>16</sup> In the end, the more reasonable setting seems to be Rome, though we cannot discard the possibility that the entire anecdote is a legend.<sup>17</sup> On a form critical level, the pericope is a chreia (or apophthegm) which has lost any sense of context.

---

<sup>12</sup> Barnikol’s supposition that the original purpose of Polycarp’s visit was Marcion’s disturbance and not the Paschal question does not rest on any ancient testimony (see Blackman, *Marcion*, 21).

<sup>13</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 351–352; as does Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 496.

<sup>14</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 352; cf. Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 54, 267. Meinhold concurs, “Daß er erst nach diesem Ausschluß für sich und seine Sekte die Anerkennung P.s <Polycarp of Smyrna> gefordert haben sollte, ist sehr unwahrscheinlich” (Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1668).

<sup>15</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 352.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 269. Harrison himself admits this (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 267). This is not to deny the real possibility that Marcion began his program in Asia Minor prior to his arrival in Rome. We simply have no other evidence that he met Polycarp in Smyrna, and the Irenaeus context implies a Roman encounter.

<sup>17</sup> Lightfoot left the question open (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 587–588). Earlier, he had sided with Rome (*idem*, II.3, 384). Camelot agrees that “Rien ne permet d’en décider” (Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 190). Koester rightly recognizes the uncertainty in using Irenaeus’ anecdote as historical evidence (Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 307). Other later stories portray Marcion being rejected by Bucolis (in the Menaea; see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 441 n.40) and even the Apostle John (the Prologue to the Gospel of John in the Toletan and other codices; see Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 267 n.2). See the condemnation of Marcion by Papias and by John in the “Anti-Marcionite” prologue of the Gospel of John (W. F. Howard, “The Anti-Marcionite Prologues to the Gospels,” *Expository Times* 47 (1936): 535). For an English translation of the prologue, see Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 121–123. De Bruyne, Harnack, and Howard agree that the “anti-Marcionite” Johannine prologue is pre-Irenaeus (see Howard, 586). Cf. Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1668, on Papias and Marcion.

Nevertheless, certain scholars simplistically attempt to equate Irenaeus' anecdote with the condemnation of heresy in *Phil.*<sup>18</sup> Glimm supposes that the Philippians sought guidance "as to the proper steps to take against the Marcionite heresy."<sup>19</sup> While it is true that Irenaeus relates the story of Polycarp calling Marcion the "first-born of Satan," we must be careful in harmonizing the accounts. Irenaeus, the later witness, may have transformed the earlier evidence: "The request 'Recognize us!' – to which Polycarp answers, 'I recognize, I recognize the first-born of Satan' – may have been artificially constructed to provide a framework for the *bon mot* derived from his letter."<sup>20</sup>

But even if we admit that one who once used such a phrase as "firstborn of Satan," was incapable of using it a second time, and that we therefore cannot accept both the anecdote and the letter, it is the former which in that case we must reject. Irenaeus who reports it was acquainted with the letter, and it is conceivable that his recollection of it may have coloured his version of the story he was repeating.<sup>21</sup>

It seems that most scholars have overlooked the adjacent anecdote within the context of Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses* III.3.4:

There are also those who heard from him that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus, rushed out of the bathhouse without bathing, exclaiming, "Let us fly, lest even the bathhouse fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within." And Polycarp himself replied to Marcion, who met him on one occasion, and said, "Dost thou know me?" "I do know thee, the first-born of Satan." Such was the horror which the apostles and their disciples had against holding even verbal communication with any corrupters of the truth (English translation in *ANF*).

---

<sup>18</sup> Hilgenfeld, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 272. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 172–206; J. Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1942), 9–12. See the more nuanced discussion in Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 37–63.

<sup>19</sup> Glimm, "Letter," 132. Völter argued that a certain Theophorus (later known through Lucian's *Peregrinus*) wrote six letters against Marcion. These were later added to a new composition (*Romans*) and the figure of Ignatius (who was actually martyred in Antioch) was then added to both this collection and *Phil* (Völter, *Polykarp und Ignatius*, 55–193). Völter's imaginative reconstruction has not won much of a following.

<sup>20</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 26.

<sup>21</sup> Salmon, "Polycarpus."

Very few scholars take Irenaeus' first anecdote about John as historical;<sup>22</sup> but many are willing to force *Phil* to fit the second story. It seems obvious that both anecdotes are highly stylized at best.<sup>23</sup>

How would such an anecdote about Polycarp come to appear in Irenaeus? We may have a parallel in the case of John. Tertullian wrote that the Johannine epistles refer to people "whom the Apostle John pronounced to be antichrists, because they denied that Christ had come in the flesh," who are "a sort of premature and abortive Marcionites" (*Adversus Marcionem* III.8). The "anti-Marcionite" prologue to the Gospel of John in the Toletan and other codices goes on to assert that John actually rejected Marcion in person.<sup>24</sup> It was a small step from finding material in the Johannine writings which could be used against Marcion to asserting that John himself condemned the heretic. So in the instance of Polycarp, some would naturally find condemnations of Marcionite teaching in *Phil*. The tradition grew to state that Polycarp personally condemned Marcion, and such a polished conflict chreia is found in Irenaeus. Nor should one underestimate the importance of ecclesiastical succession and apostolic fidelity in these debates. It would become polemically useful to attribute Marcion's refutation and alienation to apostolic and revered figures of the church, such as John and Polycarp.

Even if Irenaeus' story about Marcion is historical, Polycarp's answer would have been purely a spur of the moment remark. Such "off the cuff" comments are caused by a combination of past experiences and an automatic response mechanism within individuals. "Such forms of speech arise out of their idiosyncrasies, and so become part of them."<sup>25</sup> In that case, Polycarp may even have had the propensity of calling "heretics" by the label "first-born of Satan."<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> It is a highly stylized conflict story. Epiphanius, *Panarion* XXX.24 relates the story but inserts Ebion for Cerinthus.

<sup>23</sup> Hoffmann highly doubts the historicity of Irenaeus' "*mise en scène*" about Polycarp, due to Irenaeus' desire to establish a "genealogy of error" (Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 39–49).

<sup>24</sup> See Harrison, *Polycarp's two Epistles*, 267 n.2; Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence*, 55. Harnack claimed that "projectus est a Joanne" was interpolated in the Johannine prologue (Harnack, *Marcion*, 11–14\*). See also Howard, "Anti-Marcionite Prologues."

<sup>25</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 116.

<sup>26</sup> Irenaeus specifically tells us that Polycarp had the tendency of repeating the exclamation, "Good God, to what times you have spared me, that I must suffer such things!" (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.20). Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 588; Krüger, "Briefe," 201–202. Harrison

## Characteristics of the Heresy in *Philippians*

In 1885, Harnack wrote of *Phil* 7,

These words suit no one better than Marcion, who must have been already working in Asia Minor in A.D. 130–140. Yea, so far as we know, the description of a full-blown Docetism in combination with the μεθοδεύειν τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου, applies to him only in Asia Minor.<sup>27</sup>

Koester maintains that the reference to “perverting the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts” arises from Polycarp’s knowledge of Marcion’s revised edition of Luke.<sup>28</sup> The “oracles of the Lord” (λόγια τοῦ κυρίου) probably does refer to Jesus sayings. But the verb μεθοδεύειν normally refers to “twisting” language rather than expurgating texts,<sup>29</sup> and the context speaks of denying the judgment and resurrection, which may refer to heretical manipulations of Jesus sayings material. Harrison recognizes the normal vocabulary usage of μεθοδεύειν,<sup>30</sup> and concludes that Marcion “twisted” Scripture before arriving in Rome, where he later excised it;<sup>31</sup> he further supposes that he twisted texts like Luke 6:35 to distort the concept of the Judgment.<sup>32</sup>

But Lightfoot and others have argued that the characteristic in *Phil* 7 of “perverting the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts” does not easily fit the ascetic Marcion.<sup>33</sup> In fact, Tertullian refers to the continence of Marcion (*De praescriptione haereticorum* 20): Marcion was famous for his “rigorous asceticism” and “abstinence from marriage and procreation.”<sup>34</sup> Harrison attempts to

---

responds to the proposed repetitive use of “first born of Satan”: “As a ‘favourite expression’ of a Christian bishop, or as a ‘general term of abuse’, it fails to impress, and seems merely vulgar” (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 201).

<sup>27</sup> Harnack, “Lightfoot,” 187.

<sup>28</sup> Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 307.

<sup>29</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 24. Tertullian contrasts the twisting methods of Valentinus with the excising methods of Marcion (*De praescriptione haereticorum* 38).

<sup>30</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 178.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 180.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 198.

<sup>33</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 586. Steinmetz’ contention that the phrase prepares the reader for the Valens case seems to read every detail in the letter in the light of this scandal (Steinmetz, “Polykarp von Smyrna,” 73).

<sup>34</sup> K. Aland, “Marcion–Marcionites–Marcionism,” in *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, ed. A. Di Berardino, trans. A. Walford (New York: Oxford University, 1992). See also Muehlenberg, “Marcion’s Jealous God,” 108.

distinguish between *πρὸς ἐπιθυμίᾳς* and *κατὰ ἐπιθυμίᾳς*, and he translates *Phil* 7.1 as “to suit their own likings.”<sup>35</sup> Yet 2 Peter 3:3 definitely uses *κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας* in a negative sense of “lusts.”<sup>36</sup> *Phil* itself uses *ἐπιθυμία* in the sense of “lust” elsewhere:

Likewise also let the younger men be blameless in all things; caring above all for purity, and curbing themselves from all evil; for it is good to be cut off from the lust (*ἐπιθυμιῶν*) of the things in the world, because every lust (*ἐπιθυμία*) warreth against the Spirit, and neither fornicators nor the effeminate nor sodomites shall inherit the Kingdom of God, nor they who do iniquitous things (*Phil* 5.3).

Furthermore, the discussion of *ἐπιθυμία* in *Phil* 7.1 within the context of a denial of a future judgment appears to bolster a libertine interpretation: “And whoever perverts the oracles of the Lord for his own lusts, and says that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, this man is the first-born of Satan.”<sup>37</sup> This entire discussion, of course, assumes that polemical slander is historically based—a doubtful assumption. Bad theology was regularly connected with bad morals.<sup>38</sup> Yet, as Schoedel concludes, “Although there is probably misrepresentation and exaggeration here, it would have been difficult to use such language of the ascetic Marcion.”<sup>39</sup>

*Phil* 7.1 also implies that the opponents denied the reality of Christ’s suffering on the cross. Marcion, however, defended the actuality of Christ’s passion and attached “high value” to it.<sup>40</sup> For Marcion, redemption came through the death and resurrection of Christ.<sup>41</sup> Harnack writes,

---

<sup>35</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 177–178. The word *ἐπιθυμία* sometimes seems to be used of perverse beliefs as well as perverse actions (2 Tim. 4:3) (Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 269).

<sup>36</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 25.

<sup>37</sup> Headlam rather directly writes that “If you wish the words to apply to him <Marcion> you must say that ‘lusts’ does not mean ‘lusts’ but something else – but words ought to be taken to mean what they say, and if they do not refer to Marcion, there is no difficulty in doing so” (Headlam, “Epistle,” 10).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. the accusations of gormandizing, gluttony, and venality against Montanists (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.18).

<sup>39</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 25. See also Wilson, “Marcion,” 50.

<sup>40</sup> Blackman, *Marcion*, 100; cf. Maier, “Purity,” 31 n.8.

<sup>41</sup> Blackman, *Marcion*, 102. See Muehlenberg’s interpretation of the “ransom” nature of Christ’s death in Marcion’s thought (Muehlenberg, “Marcion’s Jealous God,” 109); cf. Wilson, “Marcion,” 49; Balás, “Marcion Revisited,” 100.

Zweitens ist es zwar richtig, daß der Doketismus Marcion's auch auf seine Auffassung des Kreuzestodes Christi einwirken mußte; allein dass er das "μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ" nicht bekannt habe, läßt sich von diesem strengen Paulusschüler doch nicht sagen, wenigstens ist das eine tendenziöse Darstellung seiner Lehre; der Kreuzestod Christi war für Marcion sehr wichtig, obgleich er Doker war.<sup>42</sup>

Tertullian even called Marcion on his inconsistency: *aufer hoc quoque, Marcion, immo hoc potius. Quid enim indignius Deo? quid magis erubescendum, nasci an mori?* (*De carne Christi* 5.1).<sup>43</sup>

The passage in *Phil* 7 continues by stating that whoever "says that there is neither resurrection nor judgment, – this man is the first-born of Satan." *Phil* 2.1 also stresses resurrection and judgment against opponents. Marcion claimed to believe in the "resurrection." But he used the words of his master Paul referring to a "spiritual body" (1 Corinthians 15:44) to refer to the resurrection of the soul, not the body.<sup>44</sup> His edition of Luke did not contain Luke 24:12, 39, 40, and 48–53, which refer to Peter's dash to the tomb, Jesus' invitation to handle his body, his exhibition of his hands and feet, and his ascension.<sup>45</sup>

To our knowledge, Marcion never denied a future judgment.<sup>46</sup> In fact, he taught that the judgment is the special task of the Demiurge.<sup>47</sup> Harrison must conclude that Marcion modified his teaching on judgment after he arrived in Rome.<sup>48</sup> Barnard summarizes, "There is nothing specifically Marcionite in the doctrines attacked in this passage."<sup>49</sup> It even seems strange to conclude the section by introducing fasting as a means of warding off Marcionite heresy (*Phil* 7.2), since Marcion was famous for the practice.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Harnack, *Chronologie*, vol. 1, 388.

<sup>43</sup> *PL* 2.760. Irenaeus did mistakenly accuse Marcion of making Christ's sufferings only apparent (Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III.16.1).

<sup>44</sup> See Balás, "Marcion Revisited," 101.

<sup>45</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 181.

<sup>46</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 120; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 25; Muehlenberg, "Marcion's Jealous God," 105–106.

<sup>47</sup> Early on, Harnack maintained that *Phil* 7 referred to Marcion's explaining away of the Lukan passages dealing with the resurrection of the body and judgment as an action of the Father of Jesus Christ (Harnack, *Die Zeit des Ignatius*, 10).

<sup>48</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 183.

<sup>49</sup> Barnard, "Problem," 34.

<sup>50</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 26.



Lightfoot also notes that Marcion prohibited marriage, but that *Phil* is silent on this matter. On the other hand, Meinhold and Nielsen counter that Polycarp's stress on the marriage relationship in 4.2 was indeed written against Marcion's asceticism.<sup>51</sup> Yet this passing reference to the duties of wives in the midst of *Haustafeln* barely qualifies as a "stress" against Marcionite asceticism.<sup>52</sup> Nor does it seem to prepare for the discussion of Valens' wife as some have argued.<sup>53</sup>

The characteristics one most expects in a vilification of Marcion (the doctrine of two gods and the rejection of the Old Testament) are not mentioned at all in *Phil*.<sup>54</sup> This seems peculiar, since, for example, Tertullian labeled the opposition of the two Testaments "*proprium et principale opus Marcionis*" (*Adversus Marcionem* I.19). In this regard, it seems rather strange for Harrison to wonder "what more Polycarp could have said, to show that the False Teaching he had chiefly in view was that of Marcion – short of naming him."<sup>55</sup> Nielsen responds, "This is surprising in view of Harrison's own admission that the 'best known, most characteristic,' 'most outstanding,' and 'main' elements of Marcion are not even referred to by Polycarp."<sup>56</sup>

Harrison supposes that Marcion adopted these two characteristic views later in Rome.<sup>57</sup> In this manner, Harrison avoids the difficulties by reconstructing "the earlier and less mature phase of Marcion's propaganda."<sup>58</sup> But as he himself admits, evidence for this supposed early phase is "comparatively scant,"<sup>59</sup> allowing him to mold the representation as he wishes. In the case of the doctrine of two gods, he cites specific evidence, since various ancient authors relate that Marcion gleaned his doctrine of two gods from Cerdo, a heretic in Rome.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Meinhold, "Polykarpos," 1687; Nielsen, "Polycarp and Marcion," 299.

<sup>52</sup> Similar imaginary attacks on Marcionite teachings are given by Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 202–203.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 17.

<sup>54</sup> Harnack asserts that "es fehlen die Hauptlehren M.'s von den beiden Götten und von der Verwerflichkeit des A.T.'s" (Harnack, *Marcion*, 5\* n.4).

<sup>55</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 197.

<sup>56</sup> Nielsen, "Polycarp and Marcion," 297.

<sup>57</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 184, 192, 197.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 172.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 184.

<sup>60</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 183–197. See Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III.4.3 This may merely be an example of the desire to establish heretical succession. Puech contests this ancient testimony, laying the cause of Marcion's ditheism at the feet of an exegetical confrontation

The only Marcionite doctrine that is explicitly refuted is docetic christology (*Phil* 7.1), but of course this doctrine was held by many Gnostic-related heresies. So Harrison concludes that Marcion was a docetist, but not a dualist, prior to his encounter with Cerdo. He further supposes that Marcion changed his views on the Old Testament, on judgment, and on the handling of the λόγια τοῦ κυρίου after his Italian arrival. But if we take away Marcion's characteristic doctrines to form an "early Marcion" that fits *Phil*, "is not that simply another way of saying that the false teacher at Philippi cannot be identified with Marcion?"<sup>61</sup> Hoffmann agrees, "If the most characteristic of Marcion's opinions had still to be formulated, how can we be certain that the proscribed teaching is Marcionism?"<sup>62</sup>

The entire issue is further complicated by Knox's position that Marcion's seminal teachings were already in place as early as A.D. 120 or even 110.<sup>63</sup> Hoffmann argues that not only Polycarp, but also Ignatius, was attacking Marcionism: "the doctrinal structure of Marcionism is presupposed in Ignatius' counsel to the churches of Asia Minor."<sup>64</sup> Hoffmann concludes that Marcion may have already been disseminating his doctrines by 110.<sup>65</sup> Knox and Hoffmann stress that Justin Martyr, writing in 150, related that Marcion was teaching "even yet now" (καὶ νῦν ἔτι), implying some distance of time (*Apology* 1.26).<sup>66</sup> Justin also hyperbolically claimed that the Marcionite doctrines had spread throughout

---

between the Hebrew Scriptures and the emerging New Testament (Puech, Review, 102). Harnack argued for Marcion's originality (Harnack, *Marcion*, 34–39\*). Lindemann stresses a Gnostic influence upon Marcion (A. Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 387). Cf. the conclusions of Muehlenberg, "Marcion's Jealous God." Wilson concludes that "His <Marcion's> sessions with Cerdo in Rome presumably exposed him to ideas which were both congenial and suggestive and which could, with some adaptation, be used to articulate and extend the views he had already formed" (Wilson, "Marcion," 52).

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 52.

<sup>63</sup> Knox, *Marcion*, 11–12.

<sup>64</sup> Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 61. According to Hoffmann, "there is a distinct possibility that marcionite teachers are among those envisaged in the <Ignatian> letters, even though they need not be the only ones" (ibid., 62).

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 51–52, 63.

<sup>66</sup> Knox, *Marcion*, 8; Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 45. Barnikol had already attempted to place Marcion's activity in Rome between 128 and 144, but his theory is unprovable. See E. Barnikol, *Die Entstehung der Kirche im zweiten Jahrhundert und die Zeit Marcions*, 2nd ed. (Kiel: Mühlaus, 1933).

the entire human race (*Apology* 20.5–6), which would suggest a period of dissemination. Nevertheless, the only reasonably certain date from Marcion's life is his dismissal from the church in Rome around 144,<sup>67</sup> and Justin Martyr is the first sure reference to Marcion. In any case, describing the doctrines Marcion would have held much earlier seems to be a difficult task.<sup>68</sup>

Unlike Harrison, Hoffmann attempts to find at least an inferential attack on Marcion's characteristic doctrines in *Phil*. Hoffmann finds "an impressive number of similarities between the doctrine which Polycarp attacks and that espoused by Marcion,"<sup>69</sup> including the stress on Pauline authority and the emphasis that the God who raised Jesus will judge the world. But the first may be related to the Philippian audience (see my chapter 14), and the latter is found in confessional material. Hoffmann also lays special weight on *Phil* 6.3: "the Apostles brought us the Gospel and the Prophets foretold the coming of our Lord." If this is the extent of Polycarp's "attack" on Marcion's canon, it is "remarkably weak"<sup>70</sup> and "remarkably anemic."<sup>71</sup> "For the moment it is sufficient to say that an allusion so vague and pointless as this would be must certainly have missed its aim."<sup>72</sup> This type of traditional comparison between the prophets and the gospel is also found in passages such as Acts 7:52; *1 Clement* 17.1; Ignatius, *Philadelphians* 5.1–2; 9.1–2; *Smyrnaeans* 5.1; 7.2; it may be "more traditional than polemical."<sup>73</sup>

Nielsen agrees that we cannot find an attack on the limited canon of Marcion in *Phil*, but only because Polycarp himself had Marcionite tendencies. The "two were not that far apart."<sup>74</sup> Nielsen's argument is based upon Polycarp's reference to Ephesians as "Scripture" in 12.1; his extended use of Paul's epistles; and his

---

<sup>67</sup> Blackman, *Marcion*, 3 n.1.

<sup>68</sup> Farmer has argued that it was the aftermath of the Bar Kochba revolt which raised questions that caused Marcion to rethink the Christian view of the Jewish Scripture (W. R. Farmer and D. M. Farkasfalvy, *The Formation of the New Testament Canon* (New York: Paulist, 1983), 61–62; cf. *ibid.*, 92 n.66; see also R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University, 1966), 127–38, 22).

<sup>69</sup> Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 53.

<sup>70</sup> Nielsen, "Polycarp and Marcion," 298.

<sup>71</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 23.

<sup>72</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 106.

<sup>73</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 20.

<sup>74</sup> Nielsen, "Polycarp and Marcion," 299.

explicit reference to the authority of Paul.<sup>75</sup> Polycarp was “stressing the authority of Paul to the near exclusion of the other apostles” and the Old Testament, and this would have been “*exactly* Marcion’s view of the canon” “at this relatively early date.”<sup>76</sup> Nielsen concludes, “Marcion may very well be the false teacher of *Philippians* in part simply because there is no clear attack against Marcion’s views on the canon.” It seems that the desire to equate the false teachers in *Phil* with Marcion is unquenchable: Polycarp is attacking Marcion but not Marcionism because he himself is Marcionite!

Thus, Harrison argues that Marcion did not maintain his characteristic doctrines when Polycarp warned against him in *Phil*, and therefore Polycarp did not attack them. Hoffmann argues that Marcion did hold these key teachings, and Polycarp implicitly opposes them in *Phil*. And Nielsen agrees that Marcion held the views, but denies that Polycarp explicitly or implicitly attacked them, but only because he himself possessed the same tendencies (at least in the case of the Old Testament). Perhaps we should weigh all these conflicting views and find them wanting.

### Traditional Anti-Heretical Warnings

I would recommend a further look at the context: Polycarp has just warned against various “false brethren” and “those bearing the name of the Lord in hypocrisy, who deceive empty-minded men” (end of *Phil* 6). The fact that Polycarp goes on in chapter 7 to speak of “anyone” does not mean he has only “one” person in mind (Marcion), but rather that he is using Johannine-like material in his refutation, as the parallelism shows<sup>77</sup>:

For “everyone who does not confess that Jesus Christ came in the flesh is antichrist”; and “anyone who does not confess” the testimony of the cross “is of the devil”; and anyone who perverts the sayings of the Lord to suit his own lusts and says that there is neither a resurrection nor a judgment – that man is the firstborn of Satan!

---

<sup>75</sup> In addition, other orthodox writers in the early second century referred to Paul as *the* apostle (see my chapter 13). See also Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 136 n.13.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 299.

<sup>77</sup> Harrison finds allusions to 1 John 3:8, 4:2, and 2 John 7 in *Phil* 7 (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 173). See my chapter 11.

“Firstborn of Satan”<sup>78</sup> is parallel to “antichrist” and “of the devil,” both traditional epithets, thus implying that “firstborn of Satan” is also a common label.<sup>79</sup> Dahl notes the ease with which Polycarp could have used previous traditions to coin the phrase “first-born of Satan” for heretics. Dahl traces the label to Jewish sources in which it originally referred to Cain. According to Jewish haggadah (evidenced by the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*), Cain, the first murderer, was the offspring of a relationship between Satan and Eve.<sup>80</sup> Philo had compared Alexandrian sophists with Cain (*Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* 1f; 32ff; *De migratione Abrahami* 74f). Another Targum portrays Cain denying the existence of a future life and of judgment.<sup>81</sup> In “orthodox” Christian circles, Cain came to represent heretics.<sup>82</sup> The representation of Cain as an offspring of Eve and Satan was incorporated by some Gnostics who turned the tables and venerated Cain.<sup>83</sup> *The*

---

<sup>78</sup> The definite article *ὁ* in “the” firstborn of Satan is not present in the Greek.

<sup>79</sup> It had also been applied to Simon Magus (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 26).

<sup>80</sup> *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Genesis 4:1–2. In J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1967), 132. Bowker comments on the dating of the work: “It is certainly quite late in its final form, but since it rests on a tradition going back to pre-Christian times, it includes very early material” (ibid., 26). Dahl believes this rabbinic interpretation lies behind John 8:44 (Dahl, “Der Erstgeborene Satans,” 76–79). A *Gospel of Philip* saying combines John 8:44 with the Cain haggadah. An echo of Jewish haggadah may be present in John 8:44, even if Dahl’s emendation of the text is not accepted. The Gnostic work *The Hypostasis of the Archons* NHC II.4 also hints at irregularities in the birth of Cain; cf. *Protoevangelium of James* 13.1.

<sup>81</sup> S. R. Isenberg, “An Anti-Sadducee Polemic in the Palestinian Targum Tradition,” *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970): 433–444; cf. M. McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 156–160. See also Dahl, “Der Erstgeborene Satans,” 75. The denial of a future judgment is also attributed to the opponents in *Phil* 7.1.

<sup>82</sup> 1 John 3:12; Jude 11; Pseudo-Clement, *Homily* III.25.1–2; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I.31.1–2; Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* 33; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* VIII.17; Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 8; Origen, *Contra Celsum* 3.13; Pseudo-Tertullian, *Haereses* 2. For an introduction to the use of Cain by heretics, see B. A. Pearson, “Cain and the Cainites,” chap. in *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*, ed. B. A. Pearson (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).

<sup>83</sup> For a summary of the evidence in *On the Origin of the World*, see Pearson, “Cain,” 100–102. Dahl (accepting the anecdote in Irenaeus as historical) argues that Polycarp labeled Marcion “the firstborn of Satan” because of Marcion’s sympathy for Cain (Dahl, “Der Erstgeborene Satans,” 83). Pearson denies that there was ever a formal Gnostic sect of “Cainites” (Pearson, “Cain,”

*Apocryphon of John* lists Cain as the sixth of the “powers” begotten by the “First Archon” (NHC II.10.34; Cf. also *The Gospel of the Egyptians* in NHC III.58.15). In any case, Dahl helpfully delineates Polycarp’s use of Johannine polemics<sup>84</sup> and correctly contends that Polycarp’s use reflects standard anti-heretical argumentation: “Sowohl die christliche wie auch die talmudische Verwendung des Ausdrucks ‘Erstgeborener Satans’ lassen sich durch die Hypothese erklären, der Ausdruck sei ursprünglich eine Bezeichnung Kains gewesen.”<sup>85</sup> Because of the traditional, formulaic nature of the warnings, Steinmetz even argues that Polycarp may not have been aware of any specific heretical threat in Philippi,<sup>86</sup> he simply transferred conditions in Asia Minor to his readers in Macedonia. “Ob er von Gefährdungen des rechten Glaubens in Philippi weiß oder nur aufgrund seiner Erfahrungen in Smyrna so engagiert spricht, kann nicht mit Sicherheit entschieden werden.”<sup>87</sup>

Furthermore, Polycarp is combating the foolishness of the “many” (τῶν πολλῶν),<sup>88</sup> and does not seem to have one heretic in mind (7.2; cf. the “error of

---

105–107). Many Gnostic works pictured Cain in a negative light (ibid., 102–103). For the necessary care in approaching anti-Gnostic polemic, see D. L. Holland, “Some Issues in Orthodox-Gnostic Christian Polemics,” *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982): 214–222.

<sup>84</sup> Dahl, “Der Erstgeborene Satans,” 76.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 75. Pseudo-Ignatius, *Trallians* 10–11 labels Simon Magnus as the firstborn son of the devil (cf. Pseudo-Ignatius, *Philadelphians* 6.1). The similar phrase *ὡς διαβόλου* appears in Acts 13:10. Dahl also cites examples of *בכור שטן* in the Talmud (Dahl, “Der Erstgeborene Satans,” 71). This would modify Harrison’s contention that “the firstborn of Satan” was a “definitely specific phrase, which we know he <Polycarp> applied to Marcion once, and which we have no evidence that he, or any other writer of that age, ever applied to anyone else” (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 200). Camelot responds, “C’est sans doute prendre trop à la lettre une formule imagée que de dire que, si Satan a beaucoup de fils, il ne peut avoir qu’un seul premier-né” (Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 194 n.2).

<sup>86</sup> See Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 21.

<sup>87</sup> Steinmetz, “Polykarp von Smyrna,” 73. Steinmetz emphasizes the similarities with Ignatius’ warnings to the Smyrnaeans.

<sup>88</sup> Bauer naturally used the reference to the “foolishness of the many” in *Phil* 7.2 to argue that “the overwhelming majority” in Philippi were heretical (Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 73). One might also compare the castigation of “the many” by Papias (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III.39): “For I have never, like many, delighted to hear those that tell many things, but those that teach the truth; neither those that record foreign precepts, but those that are given from the Lord, to our faith and that came from the truth itself.” One notices the apparently similar context of twisting the dominical sayings.

the many" in 2.1). While οἱ πολλοί is more pejorative than statistical,<sup>89</sup> Polycarp evidently is not singling out one heretic.<sup>90</sup> In this regard, the lack of a definite article in *Phil* 7 may be noteworthy.<sup>91</sup>

If Polycarp is not directly attacking Marcion, what is one to make of the warning? Pfleiderer contends that libertine Gnostics such as Simonians or Basilideans are being attacked.<sup>92</sup> But these hypotheses involve post-150 dates for *Phil*. Lightfoot argues that Polycarp's attacks may equally well be directed against Cerinthianism, "Corinthianism," or any form of Docetism.<sup>93</sup> Maier summarizes, "The most the evidence allows one to conclude is that Polycarp like Ignatius was opposing a form of docetism."<sup>94</sup> The heresy Polycarp opposes is "assez banale," "insaisissable pour nous sous des traits si généraux."<sup>95</sup>

There are clear affinities between the heretics in *Phil* and the heretics in the Ignatian corpus.<sup>96</sup> Some Ignatian opponents were clearly Docetic. Like the heretics in *Phil*, they considered the cross to be a σκάνδαλον (*Ephesians* 18.1;

<sup>89</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 12. For Greek writers, the οἱ πολλοί are those "to whom intelligence normally is denied" (Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 73).

<sup>90</sup> Ironically, Hilgenfeld used the references to "many" heretics as a means of dating *Phil* to 169. See discussion in Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 225.

<sup>91</sup> Barnard, "Problem," 35.

<sup>92</sup> O. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, 2nd ed., trans. by W. Montgomery (New York: Putnam, 1911), 365–372. Völter agreed with this position (Völter, *Polykarp und Ignatius*, 49–51).

<sup>93</sup> Andrews, "Polycarp."

<sup>94</sup> Maier, "Purity," 231 n.8.

<sup>95</sup> Puech, Review, 102.

<sup>96</sup> The problem of whether Ignatius faced one or two groups of opponents has been debated for decades (Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 301–304). Lightfoot found one group, a form of Docetism more developed than Cerinthianism but less developed than Marcionism (see also E. Molland, "The Heretics combatted by Ignatius of Antioch," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954): 1–6.; L. W. Barnard, "The Background of St. Ignatius of Antioch," *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963): 198–203; P. Prigent, "L'hérésie asiatic et l'église confessante, de l'Apocalypse à Ignace," *Vigiliae Christianae* 31 (1977): 1–22; Robinson, *Bauer Thesis*, 207–210; Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 238–240). Several authors differentiate two groups: a Judaistic party and a Docetic party: C. C. Richardson, *The Christianity of Ignatius* (New York: Columbia University, 1935), 81–85; Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 52–87; Grant, "Jewish Christianity," 97–108; P. J. Donahue, "Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch," *Vigiliae Christianae* 32 (1978): 81–93. Trevett has argued for a third group (prophetic fervor gone awry), but most seem hesitant to comply (C. Trevett, "Prophecy and Anti-Episcopal Activity: A Third Error Combatted by Ignatius?" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 34 (1983): 1–18). Trevett attempts to find the early roots of Montanism.

*Trallians* 9–11; *Smyrnaeans* 5) and denied the resurrection (*Ephesians* 7; *Smyrnaeans* 1–3). Polycarp (of Smyrna) and Onesimus (of Ephesus) may even have recommended that Ignatius address the false teachings in their churches, or perhaps Ignatius simply assessed the Asia Minor situation for himself.<sup>97</sup> On the other hand, much of Ignatius' censure might be aimed at his own opponents back home in Antioch,<sup>98</sup> and he may have warned the Asia Minor churches of the Docetic threat which Polycarp then relayed on to Philippi.<sup>99</sup> Some have also extended the Docetic similarities to include the opponents of the Johannine epistles.<sup>100</sup>

Contrary to Harrison, Polycarp does not seem to be in a "crisis" mode, but simply relaying traditional material against heretics, since Docetic-like heresies were rampant during the time.<sup>101</sup> *Phil* 7 seems to be combatting Docetic heresies in a rather loose way. The reality of Jesus' flesh, crucifixion, and resurrection (doctrines which are all defended in *Phil*) were denied by such groups. In this case, the "testimony of the cross" may refer to the witness of the cross to Jesus' humanity and accompanying suffering.<sup>102</sup>

The conclusion of Cadoux seems most pertinent: The "supposed reference" to Marcion in *Phil* 7 is "an illusion."<sup>103</sup> The views attacked by Polycarp match up "perfectly well" with heretical views around long before Marcion (1 Cor. 15:12; 2 Tim. 2:18; 1 John 4:2–3; 2 John 7; Ignatius, *Ephesians* 18.1; *Magnesians* 9.1; *Smyrnaeans* 1–7).<sup>104</sup> Various docetists, antinomians, and deniers of the physical resurrection were common fare in Greece, Macedonia, and Asia Minor.

---

<sup>97</sup> Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 15–16.

<sup>98</sup> Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 3, 91.

<sup>99</sup> Some of Ignatius' bland warnings may reveal such a situation of possible rather than actual danger (*Trallians* 6; *Philadelphians* 2). Ignatius praised the Ephesians for refusing to accept heretical teachers (*Ephesians* 9).

<sup>100</sup> Puech, Review, 102. See S. E. Johnson, "Parallels between the Letters of Ignatius and the Johannine Epistles," in *Perspectives on Language and Text*, ed. by E. W. Conrad and E. G. Newing (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 327–338; cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 173.

<sup>101</sup> Barnard, "Problem," 34–35.

<sup>102</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 23; cf. 1 John 5:6–9.

<sup>103</sup> Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 339 n.3.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., 269–270. Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 194, 198.



## The Relationship between Heresy and Avarice

Is there a relationship between the heresy problem and the Valens situation in Philippi? Maier sees very little (if any) connection between the two. There is no “explicit connection” between false teaching and greed; “the twin problems of heresy and avarice stand side by side with no attempt at integration.”<sup>105</sup> Maier asserts that the purpose of the letter was to “promote a purity-preserving and boundary-reinforcing ethos.”<sup>106</sup> The greed of Valens had caused social chaos in the believing community. Supposedly, Valens was a wealthy patron of the church at Philippi, but his greed may have caused him to forsake the financial patronage of the church’s poor.<sup>107</sup> Furthermore, his money drew him into close social connections with pagans. Therefore, avarice and Gentile idolatry are closely aligned (*Phil* 11.1).<sup>108</sup> Although greed and idolatry are connected, greed and heresy are not. Maier seems to disregard almost any role of heretical threat in *Phil*.<sup>109</sup> Maier’s reconstruction of Valens’ drifting away from the church is weakened by the fact that the connection between avarice and idolatry in *Phil* 11.1 may be based upon the traditional paraenesis of Ephesians 5:5, rather than upon historical fact in Valens’ own life.<sup>110</sup> Furthermore, in Maier’s description of Polycarp’s ostracization of Valens, he seems to underplay Polycarp’s desire to restore Valens.<sup>111</sup>

The Pastorals establish a close relationship between avarice and heresy:

Those resolving to be rich fall into temptation and into a trap and into many foolish and harmful desires (ἐπιθυμίαι), which thrust them into ruin and destruction. For the love of

<sup>105</sup> Maier, “Purity,” 232.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 229.

<sup>107</sup> Maier’s use of *Phil* 6.1 to prove the elders’ requirement of *personal* patronage of the poor seems weak; cf. Maier, “Purity,” 237.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. Colossians 3:5; Hermas, *Similitudes* 8.8.1–2 speaks of those who were concerned with business affairs and left the saints.

<sup>109</sup> Maier, “Purity,” 238.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Colossians 3:5; *Phil* definitely uses Ephesians elsewhere. As Maier recognizes, greed and idolatry were connected in Jewish paraenesis (ibid., 241–242), even as sexual immorality and idolatry were connected in Jewish and Christian paraenesis. But, of course, instances of Christian exhortation connecting sexual immorality and idolatry do not necessarily mean that the individual practiced both.

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 246 n.67.

money is a root of all evils, and some of those craving it have strayed from the faith and have pierced themselves with many pains (1 Tim. 6:9–10; cf. Tit. 1:11).

Maier argues that the “falling away from the faith” which results from avarice is not heresy but pagan idolatry. But the context of 1 Timothy 6:1–10 seems to mitigate against this view.<sup>112</sup>

Meinhold believes that heresy and avarice were closely related in *Phil*, and even postulates that Marcion had attempted to buy off the Philippian church (as he later tried at Rome). Meinhold further theorizes that the elder Valens accepted Marcion’s donation out of covetousness, and therefore Polycarp condemns him for an abuse of his position (*Phil* 11.1).<sup>113</sup>

Steinmetz drew an interesting association between the two. Polycarp wrote about a practical righteousness which was related to the death, resurrection, and future judgment of Jesus Christ, the ἀρραβὼν τῆς δικαιοσύνης. That is, the Christ event is the foundation of righteousness, even the righteous response to the sin of Valens. But the heretical Docetism threatened to destroy this foundation for righteousness. “Deshalb muß er auch gegen den Doketismus Front machen, der durch die Leugnung der Realität des Leidens und Sterbens Jesu seiner Auffassung der Gerechtigkeit die Grundlage entzieht.”<sup>114</sup>

Schoedel sees a looser connection, since “the two issues were more or less separate in the letter from the Philippians.”<sup>115</sup> While the heretics are to be entirely spurned, Valens is not counted among the heathen and can be forgiven and recalled (11.2–3). Following Bauer, Schoedel suggests that Valens was an “embarrassment to the orthodox cause.”<sup>116</sup> Indeed, the explicit mention of Valens in 11.1 follows upon the heels of 10.3: “But woe to him through whom the name of the Lord is blasphemed. Therefore teach sobriety to all and show it forth in your own lives.” Schoedel adds that heresy preys on moral weakness, and the

---

<sup>112</sup> Maier’s description of the “disjunct” paraenesis in 1 Timothy 6 “ranging over a diversity of topics and its unsystematic treatment of moral issues” seems to be an example of special pleading (*ibid.*, 235).

<sup>113</sup> Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1686–1687.

<sup>114</sup> Steinmetz, “Polykarp von Smyrna,” 74. Earlier, he writes, “Immerhin ist klar zu erkennen, daß die Zurückweisung des Doketismus nicht unmittelbar auf den Skandal des Valens sich bezieht, sondern der Doketismus als Gegenposition zu der Tradition, auf die Polykarp sich beruft, formuliert ist” (*ibid.*, 73).

<sup>115</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 17.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

Valens situation was an example of such weakness.<sup>117</sup> For Schoedel, “it is not clear” why the whole congregation is warned, since they had heartily disapproved of Valens’ actions, but he postulates that Valens’ covetousness may have “pointed to hidden impulses in the congregation as a whole.”<sup>118</sup> For Schoedel, the topic of righteousness is tied primarily to the heretical problem and only secondarily to the moral lapse.<sup>119</sup>

I would argue that the Valens situation is not directly connected to heresy, since Polycarp hopes that Valens will be granted repentance and exhorts the Philippians not to regard him as an enemy, but to call him back as a fallible and straying member (11.4). It is highly improbable that Polycarp would have made these comments if heresy had been involved. Yet I would build upon the loose connection between heresy and avarice suggested by Schoedel. The major occasion of writing *Phil* was the transgression of Valens. This sin revealed that the Philippians and especially its ecclesiastical leaders were not faithfully fulfilling their respective roles (hence the stress on *Gemeindetafeln*).<sup>120</sup> Even as the leaders had failed to refrain from avarice, there was the possibility that they might refrain from combatting heresy. (Notice the flow of thought in *Phil* 6.1–7.2). The failure of leadership at Philippi led to social chaos,<sup>121</sup> and the social chaos created a vulnerability to false teaching. This context explains the brief and stereotypical condemnations of the general heretical and Docetic doctrines. Polycarp did not have a specific heretic in mind, but was simply fearful of the ripe opportunity open to false teachers in general due to a lack of strong leadership.

The early Christian association of ethics and doctrine would have compounded this apprehension. Early Christian polemics often associated false teaching with corrupt morality (cf. Hippolytus’ *Refutatio*), and writers warned that one problem could easily lead to another. Polycarp may have even seen a parallel between the twisting of the Jesus tradition to fit heretical lusts (*Phil* 7.1) and Valens’ lustful avarice (11.1).

---

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 13, 23.

<sup>120</sup> Polycarp clearly uses the fall of Valens to warn all the Philippians, especially the leaders (*Phil* 11.1–4; cf. Steinmetz, “Polykarp von Smyrna,” 65–66).

<sup>121</sup> Maier, “Purity.”

## Chapter 7

### The Epistolary Features of *Philippians*

In recent years, scholars of the early Church have increasingly employed form and rhetorical criticism in the study of early Christian texts. However, not much research has focused on Polycarp's brief *Phil*.<sup>1</sup> This chapter attempts a preliminary study of the epistolary criticism of *Phil*, and the following chapters apply rhetorical criticism.

#### Greco-Roman Letter Writing

Polycarp's *Phil* is an example of early Christian letter-writing.<sup>2</sup> The letter is "arguably the most important, and certainly the most prevalent type of literature in early Christianity."<sup>3</sup> Hellenistic letters were characterized by their expression of friendly relationship (φιλοφρονήσις),<sup>4</sup> their fiction of personal presence (παρουσία), and their conversational speech with the recipient (ὁμιλία).<sup>5</sup>

The "personal presence" aspect of letters is explicitly cited by Seneca, "I prefer that my letters should be just what my conversation would be if you and I were sitting in one another's company or taking walks together" (Seneca, *Epistle* 75).<sup>6</sup> Similarly, one of the Oxyrhynchus papyri states, "When you read this letter

---

<sup>1</sup> Stowers notes the lack of epistolary study of the Apostolic Fathers in general (Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 25).

<sup>2</sup> Unlike Deissmann, I will make no distinction between "letters" and "epistles" (see *ibid.*, 19–20).

<sup>3</sup> Stowers, "Letters."

<sup>4</sup> Ancient teachers stressed the difference between friendship in letters and flattery (see Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 39).

<sup>5</sup> H. Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Tiedeakademie, 1956), 57–59.

<sup>6</sup> English translation in A. J. Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation, a Greco-Roman Sourcebook* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 43; cf. Seneca, *Epistle* 40.1.

imagine that I am speaking to you" (*P.Oxy.* 32).<sup>7</sup> For this reason, ancient authors regularly correlated face-to-face communication with the writing of letters while absent.<sup>8</sup> In a sense, a letter was "one half of a dialogue" or "a surrogate for an actual dialogue."<sup>9</sup>

Letters were also characterized by their occasionality; they were intimately connected to a certain historical context. I have already examined *Phil*'s specific occasion in my chapters 5 and 6. Ancient epistolographers also encouraged brevity and clarity in letters.<sup>10</sup> Finally, letters usually evidenced a previous relationship, whether familiar, commercial, pedagogical, or military.<sup>11</sup> This may support my contention that Polycarp and the Philippians had had contact prior to the Ignatian journey.

Ancient letters are available through four avenues: preservation through literary transmission, preservation in inscriptions, preservation within other forms of literature, and modern discovery. *Phil* is available through literary transmission, though we have seen that the textual history is only complete in the Latin translation. Stowers argues that letters preserved in this manner "tend to be more consciously literary" and are "often highly shaped by Greek or Latin rhetoric."<sup>12</sup>

*Grammatici* probably taught boys in the secondary level of education the basics of letter writing.<sup>13</sup> Students acquired letter-writing skills through the imitation of models rather than through the learning of theories or rules. Several discussions and handbooks of letter writing were written before Polycarp's time.

<sup>7</sup> English translation in Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 157.

<sup>8</sup> Pseudo-Diogenes, *Third Cynic Letter* (see A. J. Malherbe, *The Cynic Epistles* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 95); Seneca, *Epistle* 75.1; Jerome, *Epistle to Florentinus*; *P.Oxy.* 3067; Cicero, *Letters to His Friends* 14.2. The correlation was so commonplace, that a letter parody could exaggerate: "Thou hast come! Well hast thou done!" You have indeed come, even though absent, by means of your letter. ... Moreover, you also never slacken, but without ceasing you benefit those who are present with you and by your letters not only cheer but even heal those who are absent" ("Julian," *Epistle to Iamblichus*; English translation from *LCL*). In these cases, "letters" seems to refer to "letter writing."

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 79.

<sup>10</sup> W. G. Doty, *Letters in Primitive Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), 14–15.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>12</sup> Stowers, "Letters."

<sup>13</sup> See the qualifications Stowers places on generalization about Greco-Roman education (Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 32–33).

The first significant work, *On Style (De Elocutione)* was composed sometime between the third century B.C. and the first century A.D.<sup>14</sup> This handbook, attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum, discusses twenty-one types of letters. Demetrius provides an explanation and an example for each type. Theon (first century A.D.) created rhetorical exercises which included letter writing as an exercise in *prosopoiia*.<sup>15</sup> Stowers maintains that “The letters in the NT and among the writings of the Apostolic Fathers clearly reflect a knowledge of the more advanced level of handbook although not of advanced rhetorical training.”<sup>16</sup> The earliest Christian letters (such as those in the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers) differ from Christian letters of the fourth and fifth centuries in two ways: they use the rhetoric of the technical handbooks and sophistic traditions less, and they reflect the ethos of the household more than the ethos of Greek male friendship.<sup>17</sup>

### The Letter Opening

Doty comments, “Probably the most striking feature to someone who has read through Hellenistic letters in Greek and in Latin from about the fourth century B.C. to the fourth century A.D., is the fact that they are so amazingly stereotyped and bound to tradition.”<sup>18</sup> The ancient letter traditionally consisted of the opening, the body, and the closing.

The letter opening began with a *praescriptio* which provided the sender, the recipients, and the greeting (formally described as *x* to *y*, *greeting*).<sup>19</sup> The *praescriptio* of *Phil* states: “Polycarp and the elders with him to the church of God sojourning in Philippi; mercy and peace from God Almighty and Jesus Christ our Saviour be multiplied to you.” This letter opening may be modeled after *I*

---

<sup>14</sup> Stowers dates *On Style* to the first century B.C. (Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 34).

<sup>15</sup> Letter-writing handbooks written after Polycarp's era include those of Philostratus (third century), Julius Victor (fourth century) and Libanius (fourth century) (Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 34).

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Doty, *Letters*, 12.

<sup>19</sup> Here, *praescriptio* is used in the epistolary sense of preliminary inscription, rather than in the legal sense, as in Tertullian's *De praescriptione haereticorum*.

*Clement*, which Polycarp definitely knew.<sup>20</sup> Polycarp did not refer to himself as “bishop,” though I have come to the conclusion that he was more than merely one elder among equals (see my chapter 4). Bauer argued that the phrase “and the elders with him” referred to the elders on his side in a feud with heretical elders.<sup>21</sup> However, the construction does not necessarily imply opposition, but rather close relationship.<sup>22</sup> The idea of “sojourning” was transferred from the Jewish diaspora to Christians (1 Peter 1:1; 2:11).<sup>23</sup>

Rather than the usual χαίρειν (“greeting”) found in most Hellenistic letters (cf. Acts 15:23; 23:25; James 1:1), Polycarp writes, “mercy and peace to you” (ἐλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη). This differs from the most common New Testament greeting (and the usual Pauline formula) “grace and peace” (Rom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:3; 2 Cor. 1:2; Gal. 1:3; Eph. 1:2; Phil. 1:2; Col. 1:2; 1 Thess. 1:1; 2 Thess. 2:2; Tit. 1:4; Philm. 3; 1 Pet. 1:2; 2 Pet. 1:2; *1 Clement* prescr.). 1 Timothy 1:2 and 2 Timothy 1:2 (as well as 2 John 3) have “grace, mercy and peace.” Jude 1:2 has “mercy, peace and love.” Ignatius’ characteristic formula seems to have been “abundant greeting.” Like *Phil*, 2 *Baruch* 78:2 has “mercy and peace.” Polycarp also differs from both the “undisputed” Pauline greetings and the “disputed” Pauline greetings in his use of the aorist optative verb πληθυνθείη.<sup>24</sup> The Pauline materials do not include an explicit verb, but the dative construction with an implied verb.

Following the *praescriptio*, letters often contained a prayer for the recipient, a wish for the recipient’s health, a statement of thanksgiving to the gods, or an expression of aggravation or joy. Reprimanding statements of aggravation or incredulity often used θαυμάζω πῶς (ὅτι) . . . ; “joy expressions” regularly employed the aorist ἐχάρην or a related verb. Often, the occasion of rejoicing

---

<sup>20</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 321. Similarities include the recipient as a “sojourning (παροικουσία) church” and the invocation that the attributes of “God Almighty (Θεοῦ παντοκράτορος)” may “be multiplied (πληθυνθείη).”

<sup>21</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 70. Moffatt took a somewhat similar view (J. Moffatt, “An Approach to Ignatius,” *Harvard Theological Review* 29 (1936): 13 n.20). Earlier, W. Bauer had translated the phrase in a less biased fashion (Bauer, *Die Briefe*, 285).

<sup>22</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 8. Similarly, one of Augustine’s letters opens with, “Augustine and the brethren who are with me send greeting in the Lord” (Augustine, *Epistula* 210: *Epistle to a Christian Circle*; English translation in *LCL*).

<sup>23</sup> In the Septuagint and in Philo, the word designated a foreigner dwelling in a country not his own (cf. Hebrews 11:9). See Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 202 n.1.

<sup>24</sup> Also found in *1 Clement* inscr.

involved the receipt of oral news or a letter. This “joy expression” serves as a type of *captatio benevolentiae*.<sup>25</sup> Polycarp rejoiced (συνεχάρην) in the continuing faith of the Philippians.<sup>26</sup>

One can apply Schubert’s and Jervis’ works on Pauline thanksgivings to Polycarp’s “joy expression.”<sup>27</sup> (1) Polycarp’s “joy expression” begins with the main verb (συνεχάρην). (2) Polycarp then uses an adverbial construction to express the manner of his thanksgiving (μεγάλως ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ). (3) Polycarp proceeds with the participial constructions δεξαμένοις κ.τ.λ. and προπέψασιν κ.τ.λ. (4) Next follows a causal construction using ὅτι: “that your firmly rooted faith, which was famous in past years, still flourishes and bears fruit unto our Lord Jesus Christ.”

The συνεχάρην is an epistolary aorist.<sup>28</sup> It not only introduces a joy expression, it also begins a passage which implicitly acts as an exhortation. Polycarp rejoices that their faith continues to flourish; but the implication is that he is entreating them to continue in their confident belief.<sup>29</sup>

A grammatical difficulty is found in *Phil* 1. Certain scholars have used this inconsistency to assert that the chapter has been interpolated.<sup>30</sup> As the text now stands, Polycarp writes,

I rejoice greatly with you in our Lord Jesus Christ that you have <received><sup>31</sup> the pattern of true love, and have helped on their way, as opportunity was given you, those who were bound in chains, which become the saints, and are the diadems of those who have been truly chosen

---

<sup>25</sup> “He has learnt from his wise teacher Paul the great lesson that, before attempting to rebuke a fault, or correct an error, in his readers, it is always well to begin by ranging himself alongside of their better nature, and showing that he is not blind to any reasons for thanksgiving in the report that has reached him of their present state” (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 161). Ancient authorities recommended placing praise before exhortations to improvement (see Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 80–81, 89).

<sup>26</sup> Steinmetz sees an implied contrast between the expression of joy in 1.1 and the expression of sorrow in 11.1 (Steinmetz, “Polykarp von Smyrna,” 67).

<sup>27</sup> P. Schubert, *The Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939). L. A. Jervis, *The Purpose of Romans* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 86–109.

<sup>28</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 155. Schoedel further theorizes that the epistolary aorists in 1.1 (συνεχάρην) and perhaps 11.1 (συνελυπήθην behind the *consistatus sum*?) may introduce topics mentioned by the Philippians (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 10).

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

<sup>30</sup> Joly, *Le dossier*, 28–29.

<sup>31</sup> Here, the *LCL* unfortunately translates δεξαμένους as “followed” instead of “received.”



by God and our Lord. I rejoice also that<sup>32</sup> your firmly rooted faith, which was famous in past years, still flourishes and bears fruit unto our Lord Jesus Christ. . .

Schoedel rightly notes, "This is the least explicit reference to Ignatius in Polycarp and does not tell us a great deal by itself. Yet it is recognized that if it stands, there is less reason for excising the other references to Ignatius."<sup>33</sup> The awkwardness of this passage revolves around the fact that Polycarp seemingly provides two causes for his joy: (1) the Philippian reception of Ignatius and his companions and (2) their abiding, fruitful faith.<sup>34</sup> But the first "cause" is a participial phrase (δεξαμένοις κ.τ.λ.) and the second "cause" is a καὶ ὅτι clause. This lack of parallelism is a clear example of syntactical inconsistency which supports the view that the segment beginning with δεξαμένοις and ending immediately prior to καὶ ὅτι has been interpolated.

Those defending the authenticity of this passage have taken two approaches. The traditional method has been to summarily dismiss the inconsistency as an *anakolouthon*. Lightfoot pointed to similar awkward καὶ ὅτι constructions in *Phil* 2.3 and 5.2<sup>35</sup>, but these quotation contexts do not provide precise parallels. *Anakoloutha* regularly involve "Zwischensätze oder Parenthesen,"<sup>36</sup> but none of the grammarians' examples exactly resembles the case of *Phil* 1.<sup>37</sup>

Schoedel has recently provided a new solution.<sup>38</sup> A copyist (or even Polycarp himself, upon re-reading his manuscript), added the καί before the ὅτι. Schoedel gives a somewhat similar example from a papyrus in which an editor added a καί in a joy expression (*BGU* 4.1080).<sup>39</sup> If we take out the καί, the two parts of chapter 1 are not meant to be taken as parallels; the first becomes the occasion for Polycarp's joy and only the second remains the substance of his joy.

---

<sup>32</sup> Here, the *LCL* takes the liberty to translate καὶ ὅτι as "I rejoice also that. . ." My discussion below questions such a translation.

<sup>33</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp's Witness," 3.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Kleist's translation of 1.2: "I also congratulate you on the fact that your firmly rooted faith, celebrated ever since the earliest days, persists till now and still brings forth fruit . . ." (Kleist, *Didache*, 76).

<sup>35</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 323.

<sup>36</sup> R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, 2 Teil: Satzlehre, 3rd ed., ed. B. Gerth (Hannover: Hahn, 1904), 588–491.

<sup>37</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp's Witness," 3.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Schoedel's earlier acceptance of the *anakolouthon* view (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 9).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Schoedel, "Polycarp's Witness," 5.

Form criticism reveals how this construction might function. Most joy expressions include the verb (usually *ἐχάρην*, but occasionally *συνεχάρην*), an intensifying adverb such as *λίαν* or *μεγάλως*, a statement about the occasion of reception of a letter or news (often employing a participle such as *λαβών* or *δεξάμενος*),<sup>40</sup> and the designation of the substance of joy (often introduced by *ἐπί* or *ὅτι*). An “average” example runs something along these lines: “I rejoice greatly, having received your letter, that you are in good health.”

If we accept Schoedel’s emendation that *καί* was originally absent before the *ὅτι*, the flow of Polycarp’s joy expression would be as follows: Polycarp uses *συνεχάρην* as his verb of joy, and he intensifies it with *μεγάλως*. But instead of attaching the participial occasion to an event in his own life (such as receiving a letter), he awkwardly attaches the participial occasion to an event in the life of the Philippians (receiving Ignatius and his companions). He then proceeds to designate the substance of his joy using a formulaic *ὅτι* clause. Later, a copyist would understandably misunderstand the awkward passage, mistake the occasion as a second substance of joy and make the construction parallel with *καί*. Schoedel writes, “We conclude, then, that the use of the participles in the present text of *Phil.* 1.1 is suspect and that the difficulty can be easily eliminated by dropping the *καί* before *ὅτι* at the beginning of *Phil.* 1.2.”<sup>41</sup> Such a reconstruction disposes any argument against the authenticity of the entirety of chapter 1.<sup>42</sup>

The participial occasion, then, concerns the Philippians’ “sending on” of Ignatius and his companions.<sup>43</sup> The verb *προπέμπω* can be used of the act of escorting others on a journey.<sup>44</sup> *Phil* 1 does not state how far members of the Philippian assembly escorted the Ignatian entourage. We do know that the Ephesian churches sent Burrhus, who accompanied Ignatius as far as Troas (150

<sup>40</sup> Lake translates the *δεξαμένους* in *Phil* 1.1 as “have followed,” but it should be “having received” (Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, 283).

<sup>41</sup> Schoedel, “Polycarp’s Witness,” 6.

<sup>42</sup> Perhaps one could even keep the *καί* in the original and still blame the lack of parallelism on Polycarp’s awkward modification of the participial occasion.

<sup>43</sup> Harrison’s position that the prisoners mentioned in *Phil* 1 are not necessarily the Ignatius, Zosimus, and Rufus referred to in *Phil* 9 seems a little awkward (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 157). Although chap. 1 may refer to other prisoners, at least these three are surely included.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Acts 21:5 where the Ephesians escorted (*προπεμπόντων*) Paul outside the city and down to the harbor, sending him on his way.

miles). Burrhus most likely acted as Ignatius' amanuensis and letter carrier. Similarly, a few Philippian members may have accompanied Ignatius along the Egnatian Way even as far as Dyrrhacium (370 miles), though about half that distance may seem more reasonable. Perhaps along the way or at the end of their accompaniment, Ignatius may have dictated another letter to Polycarp, asking him to carry a Philippian congratulatory note to Antioch (implied in *Phil* 13).<sup>45</sup>

## The Letter Body

The *exordium* of Polycarp's letter is found in chapter 2. The chapter begins with a series of relative clauses about Jesus Christ, similar to confessional or liturgical material.<sup>46</sup> The series ends with a reference to the future Judgment. Polycarp uses this event to encourage his readers to refrain from avarice as well as from rendering "evil for evil, or railing for railing, or blow for blow, or curse for curse."<sup>47</sup> This establishes the purposes of condemning greed and of exhorting the Philippians to refrain from angry vengeance. Chapter 2 ends with an appeal to Jesus material.

The theme of the letter ("righteousness") is introduced in chapter 3. Polycarp affirms, "These things, brethren, I write to you concerning righteousness, not at my own instance, but because you first invited me." This formula serves both as an informational formula within the body (more conventionally, "I wrote you in order that you may know . . .") and as an acknowledgment of a letter received.<sup>48</sup> Formulas of disclosure often begin the body of the letter, whether "I want you to know that . . ." or "I do not want you to be ignorant . . ." (Rom. 1:13; 2 Cor. 1:8; Phil. 1:12; Gal. 1:11). Polycarp informs the readers that the theme of his letter

---

<sup>45</sup> See my chapter 5.

<sup>46</sup> Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 68–69. Cf. Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik," 242–243.

<sup>47</sup> If slander and false testimony resulted from the Valens debacle, then all of the warnings could concern this tragedy: "covetousness, love of money, evil speaking, false witness, rendering not evil for evil or railing for railing, or blow for blow, or curse for curse" (*Phil* 2.2; cf. Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 69). Steinmetz goes on to state that the widows and deacons fell into this slander and false witness in the Valens affair, since these vices are revisited in their sections (*Phil* 4.3–5.2; Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 72).

<sup>48</sup> J. L. White, *Light from Ancient Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 204, 207–208.

will be “righteousness,” as they had requested. This theme of “righteousness” pervades the entire letter, as I will demonstrate in chapter 9.

The bodies of Christian letters often included various forms, such as virtue and vice lists, household and community codes, travel plans, hymns, and apocalyptic statements.<sup>49</sup> *Phil* 4.1 through 6.1 provides *Gemeindetafeln* and *Haustafeln* (behavioral codes within one’s community and household). New Testament household codes include Ephesians 5:21–6:9; Colossians 3:17–4:1; 1 Timothy 2:1–15, 5:1–21, 6:1–2; and 1 Peter 2:13–3:7. *Didache* 4.9–11, and *1 Clement* 21.6–9 also relate *Haustafeln*. The various role codes in *Phil* follow a general pattern: (1) concrete admonitions to a specific group; 2) general admonitions; (3) theological (often eschatological) justification; (4) new admonitions.<sup>50</sup>

The purpose of exhorting the Philippians to refrain from angry vengeance is found in the *peroratio* at the end of the letter as well as in the *exordium* of chapter 2. In chapter 12, Polycarp uses the authority of Scripture to encourage the Philippians to be patient and longsuffering rather than full of anger and wrath.

Already in the seventeenth century, Daillé argued that chapter 13 interrupts the conclusion of the epistle.<sup>51</sup> Larroue specifically asserted that the original *Phil* ended with the doxology at the end of chapter 12 and that the following material was added later by an interpolator.<sup>52</sup> But when one compares other ancient epistles, doxologies do not necessarily signal the close of the letter. Wake countered,

I reply, first, that this is at the best but a very uncertain guess; seeing it is notorious to all that have ever read the epistles, either of the apostles, or those that followed after, that nothing is more common than to meet with such kind of conclusions, not only in the end, but in the beginning, and middle; in short, in every part of their epistles.<sup>53</sup>

For example, Romans includes a doxology at 11:33–36, and Ephesians includes one at 3:20–21. *1 Clement* alone contains eight such “stops” without ever truly stopping. Furthermore, Eusebius quotes chapter 13 as coming from Polycarp, so that if one accepts an interpolation theory, the material had to be added and accepted within two hundred years. But the epistle was read publicly in the

---

<sup>49</sup> Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 24.

<sup>50</sup> Bovon-Thurneysen, “Ethik,” 244.

<sup>51</sup> Daillé, *De scriptis*, 427.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 87–88.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

churches of Asia, as Jerome reports (*De viris illustribus* 17); and Irenaeus implies the letter was heavily used by his time (*Adversus haereses* III.3.4). If the supposed contradiction between chapters 9 and 13 is assumed to be present in the lost Greek and therefore used as evidence (see my chapter 10), one must assume that the interpolator was so negligent so as not to read the authentic material, or so obtuse so as to add contradictory material.<sup>54</sup> The interpolator would be “charged with a piece of bungling which a schoolboy would have avoided.”<sup>55</sup>

### The Letter Closing

The closing of *Phil* begins in chapter 13. The purpose of chapter thirteen is threefold. Polycarp acknowledges the Philippians’ petition that he forward their letter to Syria. He states that Ignatius’ letters, which the Philippians had requested, are appended. And he asks for any further information concerning Ignatius and his companions. Normally, the sender would ask for further information concerning the *recipient(s)* in the letter closing,<sup>56</sup> but the Ignatian episode has caused Polycarp to modify the conventional form. Although Schoedel does not mention this modification of the letter closing, it adds weight to his argument for a similar alteration in the opening. The Ignatian journey has altered the traditional forms of both the letter opening and the letter closing.

Many ancient letter closings include further greetings to others and further greetings from others. *Phil* does not. Chapter 14 does include the commendation of the envoy Crescens, a commendation of Crescens’ sister, a final farewell, and a closing “Amen.” Polycarp commends Crescens and his sister. Crescens may have been the amanuensis as well as envoy.<sup>57</sup> As an envoy, he may have delivered further oral instruction not included in the letter. Commendations in letter closings were common.<sup>58</sup> The closing of Romans includes a commendation of

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 87.

<sup>55</sup> Lightfoot, *Essays*, 112.

<sup>56</sup> White, *Light*, 205. This request usually preceded the farewell (Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 20).

<sup>57</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 19; cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 349.

<sup>58</sup> For instance, one ancient papyrus states, “But the excellent Acacius knows my whole mind. He will tell you even more than I have directed him to tell you, for he loves me greatly.” Cf. translation in Doty, *Letters*, 2.

Phoebe, presumably the envoy (16:1–2); 3 John is a letter of commendation; other commendatory letters are also mentioned in the New Testament (Acts 9:2; 18:27; 1 Cor. 16:3; 2 Cor. 3:1–2).<sup>59</sup>

Some ancient Christian letter closings included benedictions and/or doxologies.<sup>60</sup> Polycarp's final farewell resembles a benediction: "Farewell in the Lord Jesus Christ in grace, with all who are yours." Most likely, a Greek ἔρρωσο lies behind the Latin *incolumes estote*.<sup>61</sup> Behind the Latin *in gratia* undoubtedly stands the dative of χάρις (χάριτι). In Paul's conclusions, χάρις usually serves as a nominative subject of a "grace benediction," i.e., "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit." Polycarp, like Paul, associates "grace" with the "Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. 5:28; 2 Thess. 3:18; 1 Cor. 16:23–24; 2 Cor. 13:14; Phil. 4:23; Philm. 25; Gal. 6:18). Once again, *Phil* differs from all three Pastoral Epistles, which end with the benediction "grace be with you all."

*Phil* concludes with an "Amen." 1 Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians also close with a final "Amen." Romans most likely concludes with a final "Amen" (there is a textual problem), but its "Amen" is immediately preceded by a doxology. A final "Amen" is not found in the critical text of any of the Pastorals. The final "Amen" could be incorporated in common Christian letters, as *P. Oxy.* 1162 reveals.<sup>62</sup>

In many ways, *Phil*'s epistolary characteristics are ordinary examples of a customary Greco-Roman letter. From the letter opening, through the body, and to the letter closing, *Phil*'s structure plods rather smoothly along the normal

---

<sup>59</sup> For a brief discussion of commendations in the New Testament, see Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 153–156. Polycarp's commendation form is not as structured as the normal Pauline formula. See C.-H. Kim, *Form and Structure of the Familiar Greek Letter Recommendation* (Missoula: Scholars, 1972).

<sup>60</sup> Champion's study placed benedictions and doxologies within their liturgical milieu: L. G. Champion, *Benedictions and Doxologies in the Epistles of Paul* (Oxford: Kemp Hall, 1934). Jewett related benedictions to homiletic and preaching situations based upon form-critical analyses: R. Jewett, "The Form and Function of the Homiletic Benediction," *Anglican Theological Review* 51 (1969): 18–34.

<sup>61</sup> White, *Light*, 194.

<sup>62</sup> English translation in Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 158. A fine example of a final "Amen" following a solemn benediction in a letter closing is Basil's *To a Fallen Monk* (Letter 44; English translation in *LCL*).

epistolary path. We will return to this epistolary structure when chapter 10 discusses the problem of the unity of *Phil.*

## Chapter 8

### The Rhetorical Paraenesis of *Philippians*

Having examined how the literary genre affects the interpretation of *Phil*, I am now ready to turn to a rhetorical analysis of the epistle. Although Norden commented that *Phil* exhibited “keine Rhetorik,”<sup>1</sup> I will attempt to delineate a few of Polycarp’s rhetorical strategies.

#### Paraenesis and Moral Exhortation

Most scholars are content merely to classify Polycarp’s work as a letter,<sup>2</sup> but greater clarification is needed. Aristotle classified rhetoric into three branches: forensic, epideictic, and deliberative. The purpose of forensic rhetoric (sometimes called *dicanic*) is to establish the justice or injustice of a past action. Thus, forensic speech could be used in either defense or accusation, as in a law court. Epideictic rhetoric (sometimes called *demonstrative*) is oratorical display in either praise or blame. Thus, epideictic rhetoric could be used in such settings as a funeral oration. The purpose of deliberative rhetoric (sometimes called *advisory* or *political*) is either hortatory or dissuasive. It was often used by political orators; for example, the advising speech in a city council is an example of deliberative rhetoric. Aristotle divided the types chronologically, according to whether the addressees were “judges weighing *past* actions” (forensic), “listeners being addressed about the *present*” (epideictic) or “legislators weighing *future* actions”

---

<sup>1</sup> E. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, vol. 2., 2nd ed. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1958), 512.

<sup>2</sup> Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 12: “Polykarps Briefe gehören zu den ‘echten’ Briefen.”



(deliberative) (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.3).<sup>3</sup> *Phil* displays deliberative rhetoric as Polycarp attempts to exhort his readers to follow a righteous course of action.<sup>4</sup>

*Phil* is an example of moral exhortation. Christian moral exhortation was primarily influenced by Jewish wisdom literature and Greco-Roman moral philosophy. In fact, early Christian moral instruction most closely resembled the moral exhortation of Hellenistic philosophers and moralists.<sup>5</sup> Moral exhortation can either be classified as *protrepsis* (sustained argument aimed at conversion) or *paraenesis* (loosely organized precepts aimed at confirmation).<sup>6</sup> Early Christians did write protreptic literature (the *Epistle to Diognetus* is a clear example), but they more commonly composed paraenetic literature. Greco-Roman moral teachers often used paraenesis in the education of children or in their philosophical schools. Isocrates, the earliest known author to have applied the term παραίνεσις to his own work, wrote that his goal was to give counsel on the following: “the objects to which young men should aspire and from what actions they should abstain; with what sort of men they should associate and how they should regulate their lives” (*Ad Demonium* 5; 1.7; English translation in *LCL*).<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. G. Gammie, “Paraenetic Literature: Toward the Morphology of a Secondary Genre,” *Semeia* 50 (1990): 44.

<sup>4</sup> Paraenesis is often a mixture of both epideictic rhetoric and deliberative rhetoric. According to Stowers, “exhortation was only tangentially related to rhetorical theory” (Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 52). He continues, “Exhortation transcends the rhetorical categories. This is not surprising since it was always on the fringes of that tradition and was only treated systematically by certain philosophers in conjunction with ethics” (ibid., 93). Ancient writers recognized the difficulties (Cicero, *On the Orator* 2.64; Pseudo-Cicero, *Letter to Herennius* 3.4.7; Quintilian, *Education of the Orator* 3.4.2–16; 3.7.29ff). I am able to categorize *Phil* as deliberative since I will place it within a specific type of paraenesis: advice. Advisory letters were deliberative (Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 107).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Phil* 4.1–2 with Pseudo-Melissa, *Letter to Kleareta*; Pseudo-Theano, *Letter to Eubule*; 1 Timothy 5:10; 1 Clement 21.8; *Didache*, 4.9; *Epistle of Barnabas* 19.8. See Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 82–85.

<sup>6</sup> Gammie, “Paraenetic Literature,” 52–55; Gammie contends (contra Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 92–93) that the two cannot be differentiated merely by the intended audience (converted or unconverted) due to instances of dual audience. At the turn of the century, Burgess had argued that protreptic and paraenesis are the same, but Fiore dislodged this view. See T. C. Burgess, *Epideictic Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1902), 229–232; B. Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1986), 41.

<sup>7</sup> See Gammie, “Paraenetic Literature,” 51.

Libanius<sup>8</sup> differentiated between paraenesis and advice:

The paraenetic style is that in which we exhort someone by urging him to pursue something or to avoid something. Paraenesis is divided into two parts, encouragement and dissuasion. Some also call it the advisory style, but do so incorrectly, for paraenesis differs from advice. For paraenesis is hortatory speech that does not admit of a counter-statement, for example, if someone should say that we must honor the divine. For nobody contradicts this exhortation were he not mad to begin with. But advice is advisory speech that does admit of a counterstatement, for example, if someone should say that we must wage war, for much can be gained by war, for many things result from war, for example, defeat, captivity, wounds, and frequently the razing of a city.<sup>9</sup>

Libanius distinguished the two in that paraenesis does not admit refutation, what the Greeks called ἀντιρρήσιν οὐκ ἐπιδεχόμενος.<sup>10</sup> Stowers adds that paraenesis relates to “general, universal matters,” while advice relates to “specific, occasional matters.”<sup>11</sup> He continues, “A specific request for advice concerning a matter often provides the stimulus for a letter of advice. Sometimes an advising letter answers a series of questions from an inquiring letter.”<sup>12</sup> Because an advisory letter does not command, but often argues from expediency, the condition is typical of its argumentation.<sup>13</sup> But Demetrius did not clearly distinguish between paraenesis and advice,<sup>14</sup> and Posidonius made advice a type of paraenesis, along with exhortation and consolation.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, although *Phil* was clearly written in response to a request for advice (3.1), Stowers categorizes it as a paraenetic letter.<sup>16</sup> In reality, paraenesis and advice are difficult to differentiate: “The fact is that paraenesis was not generally distinguished from advice and the terms

---

<sup>8</sup> Libanius was born in Antioch in A.D. 314 and died there in 393. He evidences the fact that style changed little through the decades.

<sup>9</sup> English translation in Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 94.

<sup>10</sup> J. Quinn, “Paraenesis and the Pastoral Epistles: Lexical Observations Bearing on the Nature of the Sub-genre and Soundings in its Role in Socialization and Liturgies,” *Semeia* 50 (1990): 194.

<sup>11</sup> Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 93. Stowers then relates paraenesis to epideictic rhetoric and advice to deliberative rhetoric (*ibid.*, 107).

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 108.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 108–109.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 151. Stowers’ conclusion may be related to his generalization that Christian letters of the first two centuries tended to be hortatory, while Christian letters of the fourth and fifth centuries tended to be deliberative (*ibid.*, 43).

παραίνεσις and συμβουλή (advice) were often used interchangeably.”<sup>17</sup> Perhaps it may be better to categorize advice as a sub-type under paraenesis. In this case, *Phil* stands as an advisory paraenetic letter.

Christian literature adapted paraenetic exhortation to the needs of churches. *Phil*, as moral exhortation written to believers in Philippi to encourage them in their Christian living, exemplifies this adaptation of paraenesis. Traditional paraenesis functioned as socialization. When crises threatened a society or community, traditional paraenesis became “all the more imperative.”<sup>18</sup> In the case of *Phil*, there seems to have been a crisis confronting the Philippian community: the Valens affair.

Paraenesis could be oral (paraenetic speeches) or written (instructions, collections of sayings, or letters), although Hellenistic moralists preferred instructing through speech.<sup>19</sup> Naturally, Polycarp’s epistle is an example of a paraenetic letter.<sup>20</sup> Libanius, the fourth-century literary and rhetorical figure, provides a short sample letter in the paraenetic style:

Dear Sir, Always be an enthusiastic follower of virtuous men. For it is better to be well spoken of when following good men than to be reproached by everyone for being in bad company.<sup>21</sup>

Paraenesis can be either conservative, critical, or radical in its response to society’s values.<sup>22</sup> Polycarp’s letter is conservative (as witnessed by its constant reference to traditional material). Paraenesis which stresses order can be divided by social model: those which stress order in the *Gesellschaft* (cosmic, social, political, and anthropological order) and those which stress order in the *Gemeinschaft* (family, club, and community order).<sup>23</sup> *Phil* stresses the order of the *Gemeinschaft* (the community of the Philippian church).<sup>24</sup> According to Perdue, paraenesis which stresses the *Gemeinschaft* often appealed to personal relationships and feelings of intimacy. “Immoral behavior produced chaos in

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 93.

<sup>18</sup> Perdue, “Social Character,” 24–26.

<sup>19</sup> Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 68.

<sup>20</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 279.

<sup>21</sup> English translation in Quinn, “Paraenesis,” 203 n.14.

<sup>22</sup> Perdue, “Social Character,” 24–26.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 6–8.

<sup>24</sup> Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriege*, 23.

every sphere and was viewed as a threat to communal and individual life."<sup>25</sup> This analysis would seem to confirm Maier's theory that the Valens situation caused social disruption in the Philippian community.<sup>26</sup>

Paraenesis may be linked to one's stage of life, role, or membership in a group.<sup>27</sup> Polycarp's paraenesis is centered around roles (wives, widows, deacons, young men, virgins, presbyters) and general membership of the Philippian assembly (response to Valens). The interesting nature of Polycarp's paraenesis based upon roles is the order of his *Haustafeln* (and *Gemeindetafeln*). The order in 1 Timothy is bishops (3:1–7), deacons (3:8–12), and widows (5:3–16). The order in Titus is elders (1:5–9), older men (2:2), older women (2:3), younger women (2:4–5), younger men (2:6), and slaves (2:9–10). But Polycarp's order proceeds from wives, to widows, to deacons, to young men, to virgins, and finally to presbyters (*Phil* 4–6). His order may appear random or even strangely inverted at first, but it seems that he saved elders for last as a sort of climax bridging to the Valens problem, since Valens (the cause of the problem) was an elder.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, unlike other *Haustafeln* lists, the condemnation of "love of money" is found in *Phil*'s admonitions to three groups: widows, deacons, and elders.<sup>29</sup> The repetitive presence of this warning manifests its importance in the Philippian context of the Valens predicament.

The traditional and unoriginal content of paraenesis was widely recognized in antiquity. Pseudo-Isocrates wrote Nicocles:

And do not be surprised that in what I have said there are many things which you know as well as I. This is not from inadvertence on my part, for I have realized that among so great a

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 8.

<sup>26</sup> Maier, "Purity." Stowers stresses that New Testament paraenesis differed from traditional classical paraenesis in that it focused on the building of communities, not individual character (Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 42–43, 97).

<sup>27</sup> Perdue, "Social Character," 19.

<sup>28</sup> This examination reinforces recent studies which stress the innovative uses of *Haustafeln* against those who view them as general, traditional devices without reference to the particular audience. For the older view, see Dibelius, *Geschichte*, 142–144, 148–151; for recent studies, see D. Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* (Chico: Scholars, 1981); J. E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973).

<sup>29</sup> Steinmetz contrasts the relational character of other *Haustafeln* with the selected virtues and vices in *Phil* (Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 71–72).

multitude both of mankind in general and other rulers there are some who have heard them, some who have observed other people put them into practice, and some who are carrying them out in their own lives. But the truth is that in these discourses it is not possible to say what is paradoxical or incredible or outside the circle of accepted belief, but, rather, we should regard the man as the most accomplished in his field who can collect the greatest number of ideas scattered among the thoughts of all the rest and present them in the best form (*Ad Nicoclem* 40–41).<sup>30</sup>

Dibelius inferred that paraenesis often includes “unconnected sayings which have no real relationship to one another.”<sup>31</sup> But certain internal connections can often be discovered.<sup>32</sup> Nor should the traditional and unoriginal content of paraenesis be taken too far: “the assumption that teachers drew on paraenetic texts indiscriminately, without adjustment to their own teachings or the situation of the audience is unfounded and misleading.”<sup>33</sup>

The traditional content of *Phil* is readily evident. Many scholars have accused Polycarp of being non-creative (see comments in my chapter 4). But Polycarp applies traditional material to a new situation: the sin of Valens and the resulting social chaos.<sup>34</sup> The following chapter will attempt to discover the threads woven throughout *Phil* through an analysis of recurrent topics.

A common way of introducing traditional material is “as you know” (καθὼς οἴδατε) (1 Thess. 1:5; 2:2, 5, 11; 3:4). Paul also uses “or do you not know” (ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι) (1 Cor. 6:2, etc.). Polycarp incorporates this construction into his own epistle once (11.2). But Polycarp usually prefers “knowing that” (εἰδότες (οὖν) ὅτι) (1.3, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1; cf. 1 Pet. 1:18). Polycarp’s use of traditional material is evidenced by his explicit references to “Scripture” (12.1); the “teaching of the Lord” (2.3; 6.2; 7.1; 7.2); the “apostles” (6.3; 9.1), and Paul (3.2; 9.1; 11.2; 11.3).<sup>35</sup>

<sup>30</sup> English translation in Perdue, “Social Character,” 12.

<sup>31</sup> M. Dibelius, *James*, ed. H. Greeven, trans. M. A. Williams (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976),

3. Idem, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. B. L. Woolf (New York: Scribner’s, n.d.), chap. 9.

<sup>32</sup> V. P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 260. Doty, *Letters*, 38.

<sup>33</sup> Perdue, “Social Character,” 30.

<sup>34</sup> Maier, “Purity.”

<sup>35</sup> Massaux and Lindemann argue that the *sicut Paulus docet* of 11.2 was added by the Latin translator (Lindemann, “Paul,” 42; É. Massaux, *Influence de l’Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée* (Louvain: Leuven University, 1986), 177). This may be possible (though unlikely); in any case, three other references to Paul would still remain.

The “general applicability” trait of paraenesis is also found in *Phil*. Some scholars have even questioned whether “paraenesis had any direct relation to the situation to which it was addressed.”<sup>36</sup> Ancient moralists noted the tension between specific counsels and universal precepts (Seneca, *Epistle* 94.1, 21–26) But paraenesis was often modified to fit a specific situation even when it displayed universal principles. Doty refers to the “curious blend of occasional writing” and “of treatiselike exhortation” in *Phil* specifically.<sup>37</sup> Although *Phil* is addressed to a specific occasion (Valens’ sin and the resulting problems), the admonitions and exhortations take on a more universal character. Dehandschutter comments, “The case of Valens is an opportunity to insist on an essential value of Christian life: δικαιοσύνη, in all its aspects.”<sup>38</sup> Kleist agrees, “The special counsels that are yet given are, some of them, so general as to suit any Christians anywhere in the world.”<sup>39</sup> In this respect, *Phil* is similar to *1 Clement*, which uses the disorder in Corinth to expound the general characteristics of Christian peace and order.<sup>40</sup>

Perdue adds another characteristic of paraenesis: the close, even intensely intimate, relation of the writer to the addressee(s).<sup>41</sup> According to Stowers, paraenesis would be written by a friend or moral superior (older, wiser, or more accomplished).<sup>42</sup> In chapter 5, I argued that *Phil* was probably not the first communication between Polycarp and the Philippians. Polycarp’s paraenetic advice would fit the relationship and his respected character.

Clearly, *Phil* is a paraenetic letter, and paraenesis runs throughout the entire structure of *Phil*. Dehandschutter describes the paraenetic contents in this manner:

The laudatory introduction is followed immediately by a paraenetical application on the interrelation of faith and the righteous life (chapter 2). This is repeated with reference to the doctrine of Paul (chapter 3), to which a new application is added in the style of the

---

<sup>36</sup> Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 65–66.

<sup>37</sup> Doty, *Letters*, 73.

<sup>38</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 279.

<sup>39</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 72.

<sup>40</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 279.

<sup>41</sup> Perdue, “Social Character,” 242–246; cf. Gammie, “Paraenetic Literature,” 169; Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 95.

<sup>42</sup> Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 96. Stowers asserts that advice would only be written by a moral superior (*ibid*, 108).

“Haustafel”. Chapter 4 is expanded by an instruction about the different groups in the community, but again stresses concrete moral conduct (5–6,1). The warning against heresy is put in a context of paraenesis (6,2–7,2) as well as the development on hope, followed by examples of Christian endurance (8–9). The appeal to follow the model of the Lord is again accompanied by paraenetical application (10), the case of Valens figuring as a negative example. The warnings of Scripture tend towards edification (11). After the last recommendation (12) even the reference to the letters of Ignatius contains the same theme <chap. 13>. The concluding recommendation of Crescens does not follow without a judgment on his behavior (14).<sup>43</sup>

## Paraenetic Elements

Malherbe has focused on certain elements commonly found in paraenesis:<sup>44</sup> disavowals of need for further instruction, reminder and repetition, commendation for past and present good behavior and exhortation for continuation, *paradeigmata* for imitation, and a pattern of admonitions, exhortations, precepts, and other paraenetic strategies strung together.<sup>45</sup>

Polycarp incorporates reminders of past instruction<sup>46</sup> and disavowals of need for further instruction. First, in chapter 3, he humbly assesses his own ability to instruct the Philippians. Although they have requested instruction in “righteousness,” Polycarp does not feel worthy.

For neither am I, nor is any other like me, able to follow the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who when he was among you in the presence of the men of that time taught accurately and steadfastly the word of truth, and also when he was absent wrote letters to you, from the study of which you will be able to build yourselves up into the faith given you (3.2).

Chapter 12 includes a more explicit disavowal of need for further instruction: “For I am confident that you are well versed in the Scriptures, and from you nothing is hid; but to me this is not granted. Only, as it is said in these Scriptures,

---

<sup>43</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 280.

<sup>44</sup> Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 124–125.

<sup>45</sup> Stowers adds the use of *topoi* (discussions of traditional moral topics) and reasons for recommended behavior to the catalog (Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 96). The major *topos* in *Phil* is a censorious discussion of avarice. Examples of Polycarp’s moral argumentation are given below within the examination of admonitions, exhortations, and precepts.

<sup>46</sup> 1 Thessalonians, another paraenetic letter, contains numerous reminders of past instruction (1 Thess. 1:5; 2:2, 5, 9, 11; 3:4, 6; 4:1, 9, 10; 5:1, 11).

‘Be ye angry and sin not,’ and ‘Let not the sun go down upon your wrath’” (12.1). Schoedel believes that the translation “But to me this <knowledge of Scripture> is not granted” is out of place, since Polycarp (as a Christian from childhood) would have known the Scriptures well.<sup>47</sup> Schoedel believes ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπεται lies behind the Latin *mihi non est concessum*, and translates the phrase as “But that has not been left to me” (that is, the application of their knowledge of Scripture).<sup>48</sup> But the deferring language of the traditional translation is a normal rhetorical ploy.

Lake’s belief that the statement “For I am confident that you are well versed in the Scriptures” is an agreement with a Philippian claim in their letter to Polycarp seems unwarranted.<sup>49</sup> This view also fails to consider the standard rhetorical nature of such material. A similar disavowal is found in *1 Clement* 53.1 (cf. *1 Clement* 1.2). Elsewhere, *1 Clement* states, “And we had the more pleasure in reminding you of this, because we knew quite well that we were writing to men who were faithful and distinguished and had studied the oracles of the teaching of God” (*1 Clement* 62.3; English translation in *LCL*). Ignatius wrote the *Ephesians*,

I do not give you commands as if I were some one great, for though I am a prisoner for the Name, I am not yet perfect in Jesus Christ; for now I do but begin to be a disciple, and I speak to you as to my fellow learners. For I needed to be prepared by you in faith, exhortation, endurance, and long-suffering (3.1; English translation in *LCL*).

One is wise not to read such formulaic expressions too literally.

*Paradeigmata* were essential to paraenesis, as Libanius’ example of a paraenetic letter demonstrates: “The paraenetic letter. Always be an emulator, dear friend, of virtuous men. For it is better to be well spoken of when imitating good men than to be reproached by all men while following evil men.”<sup>50</sup> *Paradeigmata* could include both positive role models of virtue and negative examples of vice, both “ancient worthies” and “contemporary models.”<sup>51</sup> Thus

---

<sup>47</sup> The later *Life of Polycarp*, of course, portrayed Polycarp as knowing the Scriptures well (*Life* 27).

<sup>48</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 34–35.

<sup>49</sup> Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 299. The same is true of Harrison’s supposition that the text implicitly refers to the heretics’ attacks on Polycarp (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 170).

<sup>50</sup> English translation in Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 94.

<sup>51</sup> Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 136.



Dio Chrysostom could write, “These instances, in order that they may be warning examples to you, I have taken not only from exceedingly ancient, but also from subsequent times (*Oration* 17.16).<sup>52</sup> Legendary and ideal types of virtue or vice could also serve as *paradeigmata*.<sup>53</sup> The relating of negative *paradeigmata* often included the disastrous results of their vices, and the relating of positive *paradeigmata* frequently included the rewards for their virtue:

Thus it is easy to learn from the labors of Heracles and the exploits of Theseus, whose excellence of character has impressed upon their exploits so clear a stamp of their glory that not even endless time can cast oblivion upon their achievements (Isocrates, *Ad Demonium* 8).<sup>54</sup>

Polycarp’s *paradeigmata* for imitation are found in chapters 8–10. Chapter 8 exhorts the readers, “Let us then be imitators of his <Christ’s> endurance, and if we suffer for his name’s sake let us glorify him. For this is the example which he gave us in himself, and this is what we have believed.” Polycarp seems to borrow the idea of Christ’s example (ὑπογραμμόν) of endurance from his source, the paraenetic 1 Peter 2:21–24.<sup>55</sup> *Phil* 9 continues with other examples of endurance:

Now I beseech you all to obey the word of righteousness, and to endure with all the endurance which you also saw before your eyes,<sup>56</sup> not only in the blessed Ignatius, and Zosimus, and Rufus, but also in others among yourselves, and in Paul himself, and in the other Apostles; being persuaded that all of these ran not in vain, but in faith and righteousness, and that they are with the Lord in the place which is their due, with whom they also suffered (9.1).

True to the form of positive *paradeigmata*, *Phil* 9 relates the rewards of these examples’ faithfulness. Finally, chapter 10 advises, “Stand fast therefore in these things and follow the example of the Lord.”

---

<sup>52</sup> English translation in Perdue, “Social Character,” 16.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid. Gammie seems to disagree that paraenesis proper would incorporate ideal types (Gammie, “Paraenetic Literature,” 56).

<sup>54</sup> See Perdue, “Social Character,” 16.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. 1 *Clement* 5.7; 16.17; 33.8.

<sup>56</sup> The phrase “before one’s eyes” was common in paraenetic texts. Seneca wrote, “You must go to the scene of action, first, because men put more faith in their eyes than in their ears, and second, because the way is long if one follows precepts, but short and helpful, if one follows patterns” (Seneca, *Epistle* 6.5; English translation in *LCL*).

Commendations and reminders are not as evident in *Phil*, though there are commendations in the thanksgiving of the letter opening in 1.1–2 and in 11.3. Dio Chrysostom defends the necessity of repetitive reminders in paraenesis:

Just as we see physicians and pilots repeating their orders time and time again to those under their command, although they were heard the first time – but still they do when they see them neglectful and inattentive – so too in life it is useful to speak about the same things repeatedly, when the majority know what is their duty, but nevertheless fail to do it (*Oration* 17.2)<sup>57</sup>

Repetition is rampant throughout *Phil*, especially the recurring topics of “righteousness,” avarice, wrath vs. forgiveness, and patient endurance, as I will demonstrate in my chapter 9.

*Phil* contains a weaving together of various strategies of paraenesis. Gammie gives basic generalities (with exceptions) for differentiating exhortations, admonitions, and precepts.<sup>58</sup> Exhortations and admonitions are imperatives; the former are imperatives to do certain actions, and the latter are imperatives to refrain from certain actions. Precepts are often indicative statements which encourage action through an implied directive. As an example, *Phil* 4.1 states, “But the beginning of all evils is the love of money.” The obvious implied directive is to refrain from covetousness. Other precepts are conditional constructions: “If we please him in this present world we shall receive from him that which is to come” (*Phil* 5.2). Chapter 2 contains all three forms: “serve God in fear” (exhortation), “judge not” (admonition), and God will raise us up if we do his will (precept). Other exhortations are found in 10.1, 10.3, 11.1, 11.4, 12.3. Other admonitions occur in 10.2, 11.4, 12.1. Precepts are found in 4.1 (indicative), 5.2 (conditional) 5.3 (indicative), 7.1 (indicative), 11.2 (conditional).

Polycarp backs up his exhortations and admonitions with various argumentations. As in many cases, his admonitions often include a warning clause, i.e., *Phil* 2.3: “judge not that you be not judged.” Similarly, his exhortations often include a motivational clause, i.e., *Phil* 12.3: “Pray for all the saints. Pray also for the Emperors . . . that your fruit may be manifest among all men, that you may be perfected in him.” *Phil* 10.2 uses an indicative precept

---

<sup>57</sup> English translation in Perdue, “Social Character,” 18.

<sup>58</sup> Gammie, “Paraenetic Literature,” 58–61, 67. Perdue prefers the term “prohibitions” for Gammie’s “admonitions” and the term “admonitions” for Gammie’s “exhortations” (ibid., 67).

(from Tobit 4:10, 12:9) as a motivational clause for an admonition: “When you can do good defer it not, for almsgiving sets free from death.”

Malherbe differentiates between *gnomes* and *chreiai* (while allowing exceptions). *Gnomes* “were defined by rhetoricians as summary statements given in a general declaration to discourage or recommend something, or to explain the nature of each kind of action.”<sup>59</sup> The use of “But the beginning of all evils is the love of money” in *Phil* 4.1 is clearly a *gnome*.<sup>60</sup> A *chreia* is a saying included in a short narrative context which merely serves as a general background. *Chreiai* were not always clearly differentiated from *apophthegms*, a broad term used to refer to the sayings of famous individuals.<sup>61</sup> *Chreiai* do not appear in *Phil*.<sup>62</sup>

Other constructions, including *macarisms* (blessings), woes, *ὀφείλεις* or *δεῖ* with infinitive constructions, *παρακαλέω* with infinitive constructions, and hortatory subjunctives occur throughout *Phil*. *Macarisms* are found in 2.3 and 12.1, and a woe is found in 10.3. *ὀφείλεις/δεῖ* constructions (common in both Pauline and Johannine ethics) occur in 5.1, 5.3, 6.2. A *παρακαλέω* construction<sup>63</sup> (used in Pauline paraenesis, i.e., Rom. 12:1; 1 Cor. 4:16) occurs in 9.1, and probably one is behind the Latin of 11.1. Hortatory subjunctives (the jussive use of the first person plural subjunctives) are also common (4.1, 6.3, 7.2, 8.1–2).

Various paraenetic rhetorical strategies are clearly present in *Phil*. They may appear to be randomly strung together by modern standards, but the placement often appears to evidence a topological influence.<sup>64</sup>

## Persuasion, Ethos, and Pathos

Some scholars distinguish between “argumentation” and “persuasion” as the intended function of rhetoric. Perelman contends that argumentation addressed a

---

<sup>59</sup> Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 109.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 111–112.

<sup>62</sup> Irenaeus’ anecdote about Polycarp and Marcion is an example of a *chreia* or *apophthegm* (*Adversus haereses* III.3).

<sup>63</sup> For a description of *παρακαλέω* in Greco-Roman letter writing, see Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 24, 78.

<sup>64</sup> Lindemann and Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 242; see my chapter 11.

particular audience while persuasion addressed a universal audience.<sup>65</sup> Thurén has argued that we must separate “argumentation” from “persuasion” based upon their intended results: “argumentation aims at changing or modifying the audience’s thoughts, while the goal of persuasion is action.”<sup>66</sup> One cognitively convinces the audience of the truthfulness of a position; the other volitionally persuades the audience to change behavior.<sup>67</sup> Polycarp demonstrates a persuasive purpose as he attempts to cause the Philippians to pursue a righteous course of action.

In persuading an audience, more is involved than formal logic. Emotive factors are persuasive incentives as well.<sup>68</sup> “The ultimate power of persuasion lies in its capacity to affect the emotive attitude.”<sup>69</sup> Seneca commented that one’s emotions could hinder the application of exhortation (Seneca, *Epistle* 94.32–35).<sup>70</sup>

Bovon-Thurneysen has investigated Polycarp’s stated motivations for obedient living. They are (1) theological, including the all-knowing character of God (4.3), the honor of God (5.1), and the fear of God (5.1); (2) christological, primarily Jesus’ example (5.2; 8.2; 10.1); (3) missionary, that the pagans would be impressed by a blameless walk (12.3); (4) ecclesiological, that the body might be whole (11.4); and (5) eschatological, including future rewards and punishments (2.1–3; 5.2–3; 6.2; 10.2–3; 11.2).<sup>71</sup>

Thurén rightly cautions against centering on persuasive techniques and strategies to the exclusion of *ethos* and *pathos*, which were “the critical factors” in classical rhetoric.<sup>72</sup> *Pathos* is the persuasive appeal of the author to the emotions of the audience, while *ethos* is an appeal which involves the perceived character and credibility of the author.<sup>73</sup> Polycarp appeals to the Philippians’

<sup>65</sup> C. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric* (South Bend: University of Notre Dame, 1969), 19–23.

<sup>66</sup> L. Thurén, *Argument and Theology in 1 Peter: The Origins of Christian Paraenesis* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1995), 51.

<sup>67</sup> F. H. van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, eds., *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions* (Dordrecht: Foris, 1984), 48.

<sup>68</sup> J. D. Moss, “The Revival of Practical Reasoning,” in *Rhetoric and Praxis*, ed. J. D. Moss (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1986), 17.

<sup>69</sup> Thurén, *Argument*, 54.

<sup>70</sup> See Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 128.

<sup>71</sup> Bovon-Thurneysen, “Ethik,” 249–250.

<sup>72</sup> Thurén, *Argument*, 40.

<sup>73</sup> For brief introductions to the concepts of *pathos* and *ethos*, see the entries of Nan Johnson and Joseph Colavito in *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient*

affinities with Ignatius and his companions (1.1–3; 9.1–2), their sense of duty and perseverance (2.1; 8.1–9.2) their desire for future rewards (2.2–3; 5.2; 10.2) their respect for Paul (3.1–3; 9.1–2; 11.3), their fear of God (4.3–5.2; 6.3) and their sense of compassion (6.1–2; 11.4). Polycarp also implicitly establishes his own sincerity and good character, an example of ethos. He stresses that he writes at the Philippians' petition rather than his own initiative (3.1), he defers to the authority of Paul (3.2), he humbly acknowledges their scriptural knowledge (12.1), and he emphasizes the fact that he has fulfilled their requests (13.1–2). Thus, *Phil* exhibits the use of persuasive pathos and ethos, besides the various other paraenetic elements.

---

*Times to the Information Age*, ed. Theresa Enos (New York: Garland, 1996). Ehninger and Brockriede examine related issues. See D. Ehninger and W. Brockriede, *Decision by Debate*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1978).

## Chapter 9

### The Theme of “Righteousness” in *Philippians*

I have established the paraenetic nature of *Phil* and have examined the various paraenetic devices used in the letter. Now the study may turn to the paraenetic theme and purpose of the letter, and therefore reinforce our reconstruction of the background.

Donaldson’s statement that *Phil* “has no express object” is unreasonable.<sup>1</sup> Schoedel notes, “Although the letter to the Philippians to all appearance consists of a collection of disconnected points, it is likely that Polycarp saw a relation between them.”<sup>2</sup>

#### Introduction to the Theme

Many agree that a theme (if not *the* theme) of *Phil* is “righteousness.” Polycarp himself states, “These things, brethren, I write to you concerning righteousness, not at my own instance, but because you first invited me” (3.1). “We may assume that righteousness was the actual term under investigation since Polycarp is so careful to define it and since it recurs so often in the epistle (2.3; 3.1; 4.1; 5.2; 8:1; 9:1, 2).”<sup>3</sup> But interpreters do not agree if Polycarp is referring to “righteousness” in a theological sense (justification) or a moral sense (righteousness in conduct).<sup>4</sup>

Meinhold believes that “righteousness” was the theme of a Marcionite debate at Philippi.<sup>5</sup> In Meinhold’s reconstruction, the problem of avarice was swallowed up in the problem of heresy; he even suggests that Valens accepted a donation

---

<sup>1</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 229.

<sup>2</sup> Schoedel, “Polycarp, Epistle of”; cf. also Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1662–1693; Steinmetz, “Polykarp,” 63–75.

<sup>3</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 13.

<sup>4</sup> One readily recognizes that the discussion has been framed by German Protestant influence.

<sup>5</sup> Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1685. See also Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 170.

from Marcion. Schoedel discounts the Marcionite background, but he agrees that “righteousness” was the subject of debate. He finds that heresy primarily and avarice secondarily are examined through the lens of a proper understanding of “righteousness.” Similarly, Kleist argues that there are two recurring themes in *Phil*: purity of faith and the need for shunning avarice.<sup>6</sup> He connects the first with the threat of Marcion’s doctrinal errors and the second with Valens’ sin of greed. Dehandschutter downplays the importance of heresy in *Phil* and the whole sense of “crisis” which Harrison believed pervades chapters 1–12. He may overstate his case in arguing that Polycarp merely transferred a heretical problem in Asia Minor on to his readers in Philippi. For Dehandschutter, avarice becomes the only subject of importance in *Phil*.

Thus three basic options are available: the theme of “righteousness” pertains primarily to heresy; “righteousness” involves both heresy and avarice; “righteousness” pertains only to avarice. While I do not maintain that heresy is unimportant in *Phil* (see my discussion in chapter seven), I agree that “righteousness” is used in a moral sense in *Phil* and therefore concerns the problem of Valens’ greed. The paraenetic nature of the letter,<sup>7</sup> the moral content,<sup>8</sup> the constant use of precepts, exhortations, and admonitions, and the connection of righteousness with a censure of avarice all point to the ethical rather than theological use of “righteousness.” Furthermore, Polycarp introduces the theme of “righteousness” in *Phil* 3.1 immediately after having used the term in a moral sense in 2.3 (from the paraenetic Sermon on the Mount).<sup>9</sup> And after the introduction of the theme in 3.1, Polycarp subsequently refers to “fulfilling the command of righteousness” (3.3),<sup>10</sup> where the use of ἐντολή would appear to support an ethical concept. He later tells the Philippians to “obey the word of righteousness” (*Phil* 9.1; cf. Hebrews 5:13).

---

<sup>6</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 72.

<sup>7</sup> Lindemann and Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 242.

<sup>8</sup> “Es wird daran deutlich wie sehr sein ganzes Denken dem ethischen Ziel untergeordnet ist” (Bovon-Thurneysen, “Ethik,” 248).

<sup>9</sup> Steinmetz, “Polykarp von Smyrna,” 69.

<sup>10</sup> This may be an allusion to Matthew 3:15.

Maier has properly emphasized that the primary theme of the letter is Polycarp's response to the sin of Valens.<sup>11</sup> I would go further, however. <sup>12</sup> I submit that Polycarp is truly concerned with Valens' sin but also (probably even more so) with the Philippians' desire for revenge and their discouragement with their predicament. When the Philippians ask Polycarp how "righteousness" should rule in their situation, he seizes the opportunity to address all three issues, using "righteousness" as the central theme. These insights help us explain much more of the seemingly disjointed Polycarpian material.

The Philippians, after Ignatius had passed on by them, wrote a letter to Polycarp. Naturally, this letter probably included a variety of material. But a main thrust of the epistle was a plea for advice.<sup>13</sup> One of the Philippian elders, Valens, had fallen into avarice (11.1–4). The exact nature of his sin is unknown, though he may have stolen money from the church's common fund (see my chapter 5). If so, Valens' actions had evidently left them poor and in social chaos. The Philippians still were not certain of a plan of action (or perhaps could not agree on one). Could Polycarp help them? This was the stated purpose of their letter; but, reading between the lines, Polycarp also understands that many in the Philippian community were bitterly angry with Valens and wished to extract some type of vengeance. This was of even greater concern to Polycarp than Valens' sin, since the latter was done and could not be changed, but the Philippians could still avoid the pitfall of retaliation. Furthermore, the Philippian assembly was discouraged as it faced the situation thrust upon them.

It is in this context that Polycarp replies. He responds that he is writing "concerning righteousness" not at his own instance, but because they had first invited him (3.1). He assures them that he is confident that they are indeed well

---

<sup>11</sup> Maier, "Purity," 229–247.

<sup>12</sup> See also Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 63–75. He deals with many of these issues, but in an expository form of the letter. My desire is to deal with them systematically, showing how "righteousness" is explicitly related to abstinence from avarice, an attitude of forgiveness, and a sense of endurance.

<sup>13</sup> As Steinmetz comments, "Die Aufforderung der Philipper wird man nun nicht so verstehen dürfen, als hätten sie um einen schönen Brief gebeten mit einer Abhandlung über Gerechtigkeit an sich oder einer Ermahnung zum gerechten Verhalten im allgemeinen. Vielmehr wünschten sie, wie aus dem Schlußteil des Briefes hervorgeht, den Rat Polykarps über das rechte Verfahren in einem ganz bestimmten Fall, nämlich dem des Presbyters Valens" (Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 64–65).



versed in the Scriptures (12.1). He also humbly acknowledges that he is in no way worthy of following the wisdom of the blessed Paul, who taught them in person and by letters (3.2)

Yet, in spite of his humble deference to the Philippians' knowledge of the Scriptures and to the wisdom of Paul, Polycarp does proceed to relate "righteousness" to the situation. Polycarp wishes to stress three things: righteousness precludes avarice, but it includes forgiveness, and it summons endurance.<sup>14</sup>

### Righteousness and Avarice

First, Polycarp wants to emphasize that avarice is indeed a terrible sin against the way of righteousness. Polycarp knows that many in the community are angry with Valens, and it will do no good to blithely pass over his sin as if it were inconsequential. To this end, Polycarp repeatedly refers to the sin of φιλαργγία ("avarice" or "love of money") throughout his epistle, preparing the reader for what he has to say about Valens and his wife in 11.1.<sup>15</sup> Only those who refrain from unrighteousness, covetousness, evil speaking, false witness, and *avarice* will be resurrected in the last day (2.2). This passage is similar to *1 Clement* 35:5, but *1 Clement* does not refer to the love of money in its list. *Avarice* is the "beginning" of all evils (*Phil* 4.1).<sup>16</sup> Widows should be instructed to abstain from slander, evil speaking, false witness, and *avarice* (4.3). Deacons also should not be slanderers, double-tongued, or *lovers of money* (5.2). Presbyters likewise

---

<sup>14</sup> Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," stressed the first two applications of the theme of righteousness, but failed to recognize the third.

<sup>15</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 188 n.21; cf. Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 16. Maier further argues that the repetition creates a "grid" which distinguishes allowable and prohibited behavior and which organizes "social space" (Maier, "Purity," 246).

<sup>16</sup> Lightfoot explains the "abrupt" entrance of this reference to avarice by the background of Valens' covetousness (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 328). Kleist argues that ἀρχή might better be rendered "gist" or "sum" of all evils, even as ἀρχή in Mark 1:1 refers to the book's summary of the Gospel (Kleist, *Didache*, 189 n. 32). But the interpretation of ἀρχή as "beginning" may better correspond to Polycarp's apparent use of 1 Timothy 6:10 (ῥίζα) (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 295). By placing the discussion of φιλαργγία immediately after a discussion of ἀγάπη, Polycarp probably meant to contrast the two (Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 70).

should refrain from wrath, favoritism, unjust judgment, and *love of money* (6.1). One finally reaches 11.1, which exhorts the Philippians to abstain from *avarice*, unlike Valens.<sup>17</sup> The one who does not refrain from the *love of money* will be defiled by idolatry, and will be judged as a pagan Gentile (11.2). Polycarp draws a sharp distinction between "the Gentiles" and the believing community in 10.2; then he deftly places the avaricious individual "among the Gentiles" in 11.2.<sup>18</sup>

The three instances in Polycarp's *Gemeindetafeln* are especially intriguing, since *φιλαργυρία* is never mentioned in any of the New Testament *Gemeinde-/Haustafeln*, although it is used as a characteristic of the Pharisees in Luke 16:14, as a characteristic of people in the "last days" in 2 Timothy 3:2, and as the "root of all evil" in 1 Timothy 6:10. Polycarp has stressed the danger of *φιλαργυρία* by inserting it into three of his *Gemeindetafeln*: for the widows, the deacons, and the presbyters. Polycarp's order is also important. 1 Timothy lists requirements for the bishop first, then deacons, and finally widows. Polycarp saves the elders for last, due to the fact that Valens himself was an elder. In this manner, Polycarp prepares the reader as he builds to the climax.<sup>19</sup> Through his seven references to *φιλαργυρία* and their climax in the *Gemeindetafel* for elders, Polycarp is demonstrating to the angry Philippians that he does not mean to deal lightly with Valens' avarice. This rhetorical strategy corresponds to Perelman's "meeting of the minds" between the rhetorician and audience. The author must begin with the beliefs and expectations of the audience before arguing for new positions.<sup>20</sup>

## Righteousness and Forgiveness

Second, Polycarp stresses that the righteous response is one of forgiveness. Polycarp is also worried (probably more so) with the bitter vengeance expressed

---

<sup>17</sup> Steinmetz is probably correct that Polycarp uses Valens as a warning example for other leaders at Philippi (Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 65). But the lesson could benefit all the members.

<sup>18</sup> Avarice is associated with idolatry in Ephesians 5:5 and Colossians 3:5. At times it was also associated with immorality; cf. Ezekiel 16:20–34 and Kleist, *Didache*, 195 n. 81.

<sup>19</sup> Thus, Moffatt incorrectly believes that Polycarp gives prominence to deacons as compared with elders. Moffatt, "Approach," 11.

<sup>20</sup> Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *New Rhetoric*, 14–17.

by some (most?) members of the Philippian community. Valens has committed his sin. Neither the Philippians nor Polycarp can change this fact. But Polycarp is troubled that the Philippians' response is putting their own spiritual well-being in jeopardy. After referring to *love of money* in 4.1, Polycarp states, "let us arm ourselves with the armour of righteousness, and let us first of all teach ourselves to walk in the commandment of the Lord." Malherbe compares this passage to "the rigorous self-examination" required of moral philosophers before "daring to correct others."<sup>21</sup> But the passage serves as more than this; Polycarp is attempting to subsume the Philippians in his rhetorical "us," causing them to examine the "righteousness" of their own lives as well. The strategy of moving beyond a condemnation of avarice to a Philippian self-examination is common in *Phil.*

One recalls that Polycarp had stated,

Now he who raised him from the dead will also raise us up if we do his will, and walk in his commandments and love the things which he loved, refraining from all unrighteousness, covetousness, *love of money*, evil speaking, and false witness (2.2);

but he immediately continues,

rendering not evil for evil, or railing for railing, or blow for blow, or curse for curse, but remembering what the Lord had taught when he said, "Judge not that ye be not judged, forgive and it shall be forgiven you, be merciful that ye may obtain mercy, with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" (2.2-3).

The first part of the list was aimed at Valens, but the second half was directed toward the Philippians themselves. They should not concentrate so much on Valens' sin that they overlook their own possible temptations. Just as his avarice ruined his spiritual condition, their bitterness was endangering their own. Harrison notes that the sin of Valens had resulted in "discord within" and "scandal about" the Philippian church, and had "even come to blows."<sup>22</sup>

In this context, Polycarp stresses that Paul's letters provide sufficient guidance, even if they lack specifics, for Paul stressed the priority of faith followed by a love of God and Christ and neighbor. If one keeps these general principles, he has

---

<sup>21</sup> Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 34.

<sup>22</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 168. This last comment is probably reading *Phil* too literally (*Phil* 2.2). His further contention that γρόνθος comes from Aquila's mid-second century translation of the Hebrew Scriptures (Exodus 21:18 and Isaiah 58:4) bases much on one word (cf. Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 12-13).

fulfilled the command of "righteousness," for he who has love is far from all sin (3.3). This exhortation to love is directed toward the community, not Valens.

Once again, in his discussion of presbyters, Polycarp juxtaposes Valens' problem with the proper congregational response. Polycarp states that presbyters should "be compassionate, merciful to all, bringing back those that have wandered," and should "refrain from all wrath, respect of persons, unjust judgment, being far from all *love of money*" (6.1). But he bridges into comments directed toward the Philippians themselves: "not quickly believing evil of any, not hasty in judgment, knowing that we all owe the debt of sin." So far, these still seem to be requirements for presbyters. But he immediately continues, "If then we pray the Lord to forgive us, we also ought to forgive, for we stand before the eyes of the Lord and of God, and we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, and each must give an account of himself" (6.2). One notices the transfer to first person plural: these words were meant to remind the congregation that God would judge Valens. Their duty was to forgive; or else they might face judgment themselves. Polycarp builds this argumentation upon the authoritative Jesus tradition. "Polycarp is preparing the way for his later exhortation to clemency (11:4–12:1)." <sup>23</sup>

These are instances of purposeful rhetoric: after Polycarp wins the Philippians over by his condemnation of avarice, he turns to their own deficiencies. The theme of the *catena* of traditional materials flows from avarice to vengeance. This is an example of Polycarp's skillful weaving of sources.

In chapter 11, Polycarp does not hide behind any rhetoric. He clearly comes out and states the righteous response to the Valens situation:

Therefore, brethren, I am deeply sorry for him <i.e., Valens> and for his wife, and may the Lord grant them true repentance. Therefore be yourselves also moderate in this matter, and do not regard such men as enemies, but call them back as fallible and straying members, that you may make whole the body of you all. For in doing this you edify yourselves (11.4).

Once again, Polycarp does not brush aside the fact that Valens (and his wife) have sinned and must repent. But he urges the Philippians to extend forgiveness for the sake of the health of the entire body. This symbolism represents the seriousness of Polycarp: the goal of the Philippians is not to amputate the ill organs, but to restore them. Only then will the entire body be completely whole.

---

<sup>23</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 19.

Immediately following this section, Polycarp's *peroratio* assures the Philippians that he is confident that they are well-versed in the Scriptures. He continues, "Only, as it is said in these Scriptures, 'Be ye angry and sin not,' and 'Let not the sun go down upon your wrath.' Blessed is the man who remembers this, and I believe that it is so with you." Polycarp takes the Scriptures and applies them to the Philippian situation: they must cease from their continuing angry bitterness toward Valens. The demand for forgiveness may seem stringent; therefore, he turns to the authoritative text.<sup>24</sup> The turning from wrath is further reflected in the benedictory prayer that follows (12.2).

### Righteousness and Endurance

Third, Polycarp wants to stress that he empathizes with the condition of the Philippian assembly, but the righteous response is one of patient endurance. The theme of "patient endurance" pervades the New Testament (32 instances of the noun ὑπομονή, 17 of the verb ὑπομένω) and the Apostolic Fathers (19 occurrences of the noun, 30 of the verb).<sup>25</sup> Specifically, Ignatius had written to Polycarp, "But especially must we endure all things for the sake of God, that he also may endure us" (*Polycarp* 3.1; English translation in *LCL*). In all, Ignatius uses the noun or verb form thirteen times. Corwin notes that "one of the qualities he most covets is ὑπομονή, endurance."<sup>26</sup>

Already in chapter 2, Polycarp had written that φιλαργυρία is a sign that one will not partake in the resurrection of the righteous (aimed at the Valens problem). Yet he continues by stressing that an unforgiving spirit of vengeance is likewise such a sign (aimed at the Philippians). One can imagine the Philippians' response: Is not a spirit of vengeance understandable since Valens had left the

---

<sup>24</sup> "Polykarp weiß aber auch, dass eine solche Forderung den Menschen eher fremd ist. Fehler, wie sie Valens und seine Frau begangen haben, rufen im Menschen den Zorn hervor. Und Zorn schreit nach Strafe und Rache. Deshalb muß Polykarp mit Hinweisen auf das Alte Testament die Philipper ermahnen, sich nicht vom Zorn zur Sünde hinreißen zu lassen" (Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 66–67).

<sup>25</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 193 n.64.

<sup>26</sup> Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 23.

community poor and destitute? Polycarp immediately continues with a macarism, "Blessed are the poor, and they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God" (2.3). It is "not impossible" that Polycarp believed that Matthew 3:5 and 10 applied to the situation caused by Valens.<sup>27</sup> If so, Polycarp does not merely repeat traditional material; he has transformed it. Now the "persecutors" are not outside the church, but those (formerly) inside it.

Chapter 8 draws attention to Jesus Christ, the "pledge of our righteousness (ἀρραβὼν τῆς δικαιοσύνης)," who bore our sins in his body on the tree. He "endured" all things, that we might live in him. Polycarp summarizes, "Let us then be imitators of his endurance, and if we suffer for his name's sake, let us glorify him. For this is the example which he gave us in himself, and this is what we have believed." "Polykarp meint offenbar, wie Jesus die Sünden aller Menschen getragen hat, so sollten wir die Fehler und Schwächen unserer Mitmenschen ertragen."<sup>28</sup>

Polycarp then exhorts,

Now I beseech you all to obey the word of righteousness, and to endure with all the endurance which you also saw before your eyes, not only in the blessed Ignatius, and Zosimus, and Rufus, but also in others among yourselves, and in Paul himself, and in the other Apostles; being persuaded that all of these ran not in vain, but in faith and righteousness, and that they are with the Lord in the place which is their due, with whom they also suffered. For they did not love this present world but him who died on our behalf, and was raised by God for our sakes (9.1-2).

One recognizes that Polycarp begins the paragraph with a reference to the "word of righteousness" and that he uses these models as examples both for endurance<sup>29</sup> and against avarice: "they did not love this present world." This is another example of Polycarp's creative weaving of material. The Philippians were to bear their suffering with patient endurance, knowing that they would be rewarded in the life hereafter. Furthermore, this patient endurance included the continuance of giving to the poor, even if such almsgiving would cause further hardship on the community (10.1-2).<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 11.

<sup>28</sup> Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 74.

<sup>29</sup> *1 Clement* had already used Paul as an example of ὑπομονή (*1 Clement* 5.5ff).

<sup>30</sup> Perhaps this section is evidence that Valens stole from the common church funds.

After quoting the Scriptures about not letting the sun go down on one's wrath, Polycarp prays that Jesus Christ would be able to build them up without wrath, but in patience, in longsuffering, and in endurance (12.2). In this manner, their character would be manifested to all, and they would be perfected in Christ.

Finally, in chapter 13, Polycarp reminds the Philippians that the letters of Ignatius contain "faith, endurance, and all the edification which pertains to our Lord" (13.2). This reference to endurance in chapter 13 reveals how a central theme of chapters 1–12 continues in chapter 13.<sup>31</sup>

### Righteousness, Heresy, and Ethics

These many references reveal the centrality of "righteousness" in the epistle. Some scholars have argued that Polycarp's use of the word "suggests that Polycarp was reacting to an exegesis of Romans and Galatians by gnosticizing enthusiasts for the apostle."<sup>32</sup> But this study reveals that "righteousness" in *Phil* is used in a moral, ethical sense, not in the familiar Pauline theological sense.<sup>33</sup> For example, Polycarp adopts the Matthean sense of "righteousness" in 2.2–3.<sup>34</sup>

In fact, *Phil* seems to stress "righteousness" in a manner that differs from the usual Pauline emphasis. De Boer ties the reference to "word of righteousness" in *Phil* 9.1 with the reference that Paul "taught accurately and steadfastly the word concerning truth" in *Phil* 3.2 (associated with the "righteousness" in 3.1; 3.3) and *1 Clement*'s statement that Paul "taught righteousness to the whole world" (5.7). De Boer continues (perhaps in an overstatement):

It seems to me, in fact, that the whole notion of "*teaching (didaskain) righteousness*," found in *1 Clement* and Polycarp, is a post-Pauline understanding of the work of the apostle, an understanding that has more to do with an image of Paul than with any direct knowledge of his epistolary legacy.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Bauer's overlooking of the ὑπομονή in *Phil* 13 (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 21).

<sup>32</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp, Epistle of." See Meinhold, "Polykarpos."

<sup>33</sup> See comments in Kleist, *Didache*, 188 n.25. Kleist even translates δικαιοσύνη in 3.1 as "holy living" (*ibid.*, 77).

<sup>34</sup> *Phil* 9.1 refers to "the word of righteousness," a phrase also found in Hebrews 5:13 (*ibid.*, 193 n.65).

<sup>35</sup> De Boer, "Comment," 52. Polycarp definitely possessed a direct knowledge of Pauline letters (see my chapter 11).

In my interpretation, the Philippians' request concerning "righteousness" centered on moral conduct, not theological controversy. Accordingly, I see only an incidental connection between the Valens problem and the heretical threat in *Phil*.<sup>36</sup> While Harrison stressed the "crisis" atmosphere caused by heresy, I would stress the community upheaval caused by Valens' sin. Polycarp's moral tone of righteousness fits this situation.

The paraenetic use of the theme of "righteousness" in *Phil*, therefore, is not directed against heretics who misuse Paul's teaching about justification by faith apart from the law. *Phil* seems to consistently use "righteousness" in the ethical sense of morality rather than in a theological notion of justification.<sup>37</sup>

## Summary

My examination of Polycarp's own paraenetic purpose goes beyond previous studies. Polycarp 1) emphasized the terribleness of the sin of avarice; yet he also 2) advocated a proper response of forgiveness instead of vengeance or anger and 3) encouraged the exhibition of patient endurance even in unfortunate circumstances. The final two purposes have been almost universally overlooked by past investigations.<sup>38</sup>

All three of these responses constituted the "command of righteousness" or the "word of righteousness" which the Philippians had solicited (*Phil* 3.1). It is noteworthy that 3.1 begins, "These things (ταῦτα), brethren, I write to you concerning righteousness, not at my own instance, but because you first invited me." Schoedel correctly affirms that the ταῦτα "makes it clear that *what precedes is regarded as the substance of 'righteousness.'*"<sup>39</sup> We have already noted that all three of our issues are found in the *exordium* of chapter 2 and are supported with paraenetic Jesus traditions.

---

<sup>36</sup> See my chapter 6.

<sup>37</sup> Maier, "Purity," 245.

<sup>38</sup> Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," stresses the second application as it related to the theme of righteousness, but not the third.

<sup>39</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 13; italics his.



Polycarp gave them this three-fold answer and assured them that this “righteousness” was congruent with their past sources of authority: Paul’s commands of righteousness which he had addressed to them (3.2–3 <2x>); their pledge of righteousness, which is Christ (8.1);<sup>40</sup> and the righteous examples of Paul, the other apostles, and more recently Ignatius and his companions (9.1–2). To win their sympathy, he associates “righteousness” with the condemnation of φιλαργυρία (4.1; 5.2). To urge forgiveness, he associates righteousness with love of neighbor (3.1). To encourage them in their poverty and unfortunate circumstances, he associates righteousness with endurance (8.1; 9.1).

I have thus moved toward clarifying the “rhetorical situation” of *Phil*, the “rhetorical dynamic” within the text, and the “stylistic devices” employed.<sup>41</sup> The “rhetorical situation” is not merely the historical context of the text, but the author’s picture of the audience and the intended function of the text in its attempt to convince or motivate. The “rhetorical dynamic” involves the interactive functions within the text. “Stylistic devices” are the rhetorical “tools” the author uses in persuasion.

The “rhetorical situation” of *Phil* involved Polycarp’s belief that the Philippian community’s spiritual vitality was threatened by bitterness and disappointment and his desire to motivate them to a forgiving, persevering response in the Valens affair. The “rhetorical dynamic” within *Phil* includes the second chapter’s role in the letter as the implicit introduction of Polycarp’s persuasive goals, and the structuring of argumentation around the word “righteousness.” The “stylistic devices” in *Phil* include the order of the *Gemeindetafeln*, the preparation through the repeated references to avarice, and the transformation of traditional material.

One can retrace the steps I have taken in the last three chapters by comparing the investigation with Kennedy’s rhetorical methodology. Kennedy’s methodology involves the following stages: (1) the determination of the rhetorical unit to be analyzed; (2) reconstruction of the rhetorical situation; (3) examination

---

<sup>40</sup> For a discussion of Christ as the “hope and pledge of our righteousness,” see Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 26–28. In the New Testament, Christ is our ἐλπίς (Colossians 1:27; 1 Timothy 1:1; cf. Ignatius, *Magnesians* 1.1; *Trallians* inscr., 2.2), but the Holy Spirit acts as the ἀρραβών (Ephesians 1:13–14; 2 Corinthians 1:22; 5:5).

<sup>41</sup> See descriptions in Thurén, *Argument*, 31–32.

of the rhetorical arrangement of the text; (4) analysis of stylistic devices; and (5) review of the whole unit as a response to the rhetorical situation.<sup>42</sup>

(1) The "rhetorical unit" I have analyzed has been the entire epistle of *Phil*. (2) The rhetorical situation I have reconstructed has centered on Polycarp's desire to encourage the Philippians in the Valens crisis. He wanted to assure them that he did not belittle the magnitude of Valens' transgression. On the other hand, he wished to exhort the Philippians toward forgiveness and endurance. (3) The arrangement of *Phil* is centered upon the theme of "righteousness," which Polycarp employs in a moral sense. Further creative arrangement strategies include the saving of an explicit mention of Valens until he has prepared the readers. Polycarp does so through his repeated references to avarice and through his sequence of the *Gemeindetafel*n: wives, widows, deacons, young men, and finally elders. He saves the position of the elder Valens for last, and he intersperses the condemnation of avarice throughout the *Gemeindetafel*n. Neither of these strategies is present in his source, the Pastoral Epistles.<sup>43</sup> (4) Polycarp's various stylistic devices include admonitions, precepts, exhortations, maxims, macarisms, citations of authority, disavowals of need for further instruction, repetitions, commendations, and *paradeigmata*. (5) Armed with these evidences, one can certainly assert that *Phil* is a powerfully creative response to the rhetorical situation, even if past scholars have repeatedly belittled Polycarp's intellectual capabilities and imagination.

---

<sup>42</sup> G. A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1984), 33–38.

<sup>43</sup> For evidence that Polycarp knew and used at least 1 Timothy and possibly 2 Timothy, see my chapter 11.

## Chapter 10

### The Unity of *Philippians*

*Phil* 9.1 states,

I exhort you all therefore to obey the word of righteousness and to practice all endurance, which also you saw with your own eyes not only in the blessed Ignatius and Zosimus and Rufus, but also in others among yourselves, and in Paul himself and the rest of the Apostles; being persuaded that all these ran not in vain but in faith and righteousness, and that they are in their due place in the presence of the Lord, with whom they also suffered. For they did not love the present world, but him who died for us and was raised by God for our sakes.

This passage seems to assume that Ignatius has already died, that he has been ushered into “the presence of the Lord.”

However, *Phil* 13.2 affirms,

You wrote to me, both you yourselves and Ignatius, that if anyone was going to Syria he should also carry the letters from you. I will do so, if I have a convenient opportunity, either I myself, or he whom I shall send to be ambassador on your behalf also. The letters of Ignatius which were sent to us by him, and others as many as we had by us, we send unto you, just as you requested. These are subjoined to this letter; from which you will be able to gain great advantage. For they contain faith and endurance and every kind of edification, which pertains unto our Lord. Moreover let us know what you know certainly of Ignatius and those who are with him.

This chapter, especially the last request, seems to imply that Ignatius is still alive.<sup>1</sup> Why would Polycarp request any new information concerning a dead person?

The problem is readily apparent:- “Ignatius could not have been at the same moment alive and dead.”<sup>2</sup> This discrepancy has caused many, from Daillé onward, to argue that chapter 13 is a spurious interpolation by someone other than Polycarp.<sup>3</sup> Völter followed similar lines of argumentation and removed chapter

---

<sup>1</sup> “Une impression paraît s'imposer: Ignace est vivant” (Puech, *Review*, 97). Early interpreters agreed that Polycarp sent the letter while Ignatius was still alive (see *ibid.*, 97; Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 28–30).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>3</sup> Daillé, *De scriptis*.

13 and the references to Ignatius in chapters 1 and 9.<sup>4</sup> In his view, these passages were forged by an Ignatian interpolator who wanted to use *Phil* to authenticate the Ignatian collection. To establish his thesis, Völter stressed the grammatical inconsistency in *Phil* 1 (see my chapter 8).

More recently, Joly has taken up the cause of interpolations. Joly conventionally maintained that chapter 13 and part of chapter 1 are spurious. However, he hypothesized that chapter 9 is indeed authentic, but it originally alluded to a Philippian martyr by the name of Ignatius and not to Ignatius of Antioch.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, the later Ignatian interpolator built the forged references in *Phil* 1 and 13 on this authentic remark about an otherwise unknown Philippian Ignatius.

### Harrison's Two-Letter Theory

In 1936, Harrison put forward the ingenious theory that our current text conflates two authentic Polycarpian letters.<sup>6</sup> The first letter, comprised of chapter 13 (and probably 14), was a cover letter to an Ignatian collection and was written immediately preceding Ignatius' martyrdom (c. A.D. 115). On the other hand, chapters 1–12 were written about twenty years after Ignatius had died (c. A.D. 135–137).<sup>7</sup> Through some mistake, the two letters were merged together.

Harrison utilizes seven main arguments to prove his conflation theory and the late date (c. A.D. 135) of *Phil* chapters 1–12. First, Harrison provides other examples of such conflations<sup>8</sup>: 2 Corinthians, Philipians, 2 Timothy, Romans, the *Epistle to Diognetus*, Tertullian's *De praescriptione haereticorum*, Ignatius' *Polycarp*, 1 Peter, and analogies in existing papyri. Second, the heretic Marcion

---

<sup>4</sup> Völter, *Polykarp und Ignatius*, 16–28.

<sup>5</sup> Joly, *Le dossier*, 17–37, 111–120; seemingly unbeknownst to Joly, Donaldson had already argued this position earlier (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 228).

<sup>6</sup> Streeter had already referred to the theory in anticipation (Streeter, *Primitive Christianity*, 276–278).

<sup>7</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 315. By this time, “the story of his <Ignatius> martyrdom had passed into history” (ibid., 15). The difference between the two letters “is a question not so much of moods, or of miles, as of decades” (ibid., 13).

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 20–24.

(whose rise Harrison dates around the 130's) is condemned in chapter 7. Third, *Phil*'s use of the New Testament and *1 Clement* suggests a late date. Fourth, chapters 1–12 include allusions to Ignatius' writings, but chapters 13 and 14 do not.<sup>9</sup> Fifth, Polycarp's more mature age would better fit the tenor of the letter.<sup>10</sup> Sixth, Polycarp felt a great urgency to fulfill a dying martyr's request, and therefore wrote chapter 13 with haste,<sup>11</sup> but chapters 1–12 would have taken much longer to write. Seventh, Harrison calculates the time needed for Polycarp's original letter or response to be sent back to Philippi. He suggests that not enough time had elapsed for Polycarp to assume that Ignatius has died (as he seems to do in *Phil* 9.)<sup>12</sup>

Harrison's hypothesis has won wide support. Within two decades of Harrison's work, Burkitt, Streeter, Glimm, Kleist, Quasten, Camelot, Meinhold, and Fischer had all written in favor of the proposal.<sup>13</sup> Kleist accepted the theory as "the last word on this long-standing controversy."<sup>14</sup> Quasten found the hypothesis "very convincing."<sup>15</sup> Barnard has praised Harrison's book as a "monumental study" of "fundamental importance" which has won "a wide measure of assent from scholars" with its "much detailed learning."<sup>16</sup> He believes that the work has established the two-letter theory "beyond doubt" and "deserves rank as one of the most learned and acute patristic monographs so far produced

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 132.

<sup>10</sup> "It is neither unusual nor unreasonable for responsible folk to consider that a man in his forties is already too old for some kinds of service, and still too young for other kinds" (*ibid.*, 13; cf. *ibid.*, 170–171).

<sup>11</sup> Polycarp "could not shelve such an obligation," "The King's business required haste," and it was "worth straining every nerve to bring that about" (*ibid.*, 107–108).

<sup>12</sup> "In other words, he knew, or reasonably and rightly believed, that Ignatius was still alive" (*ibid.*, 120).

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, v–vi; Puech, Review, 96–102; Glimm, "Letter," 131–133; Kleist, *Didache*, 69–74; Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 1, 191–195; Meinhold, "Polykarpos," 1683–1687; J. A. Fischer, *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Münich: Kosel, 1956), 229–245; B. Altaner, *Patrology*, 2nd ed., trans. H. C. Graef (New York: Herder and Herder, 1961), 111. Puech seemed appreciative, but torn: "Pour résumer mon sentiment, je dirai que, si M. Harrison n'est point parvenu à me faire admettre sa conviction, il a fortement ébranlé la confiance que j'attachais à la solution, ou même à toute espèce de solution traditionnelle" (Puech, Review, 102).

<sup>14</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 71.

<sup>15</sup> Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 1, 80.

<sup>16</sup> Barnard, "Problem," 31.

this century.”<sup>17</sup> Schoedel correctly notes that “contemporary work” in *Phil* has been “dominated” by Harrison’s work,<sup>18</sup> and Puech places it alongside Lightfoot’s study “parmi les classiques de la littérature dédiée à Polycarpe.”<sup>19</sup> Rensberger refers to its “widespread” and “well-deserved acceptance.”<sup>20</sup>

## Critique of Harrison

However, Harrison’s arguments are not without problems.<sup>21</sup> First, in regard to his analogies, it is true that 2 Corinthians continues to be commonly regarded as a conflation, though not universally. And many competent scholars have defended the unity of Philippians, Romans, 1 Peter, and even the *Epistle to Diognetus*.<sup>22</sup> Harrison’s theory of the conflation of Ignatius’ *Epistle to Polycarp* has won no support.<sup>23</sup> The conflation of Tertullian’s *De praescriptione haereticorum* is not accidental (as Harrison himself recognizes).<sup>24</sup> The papyri examples which Harrison uses are simply two letters written continuously on one piece of papyri. They have not been stripped of their letter openings or closings and merged together.<sup>25</sup> Obviously, Polycarp’s letter must be examined on its own merits.

Second, many have argued that *Phil* 7 does not easily fit into a condemnation of Marcion. I have already addressed this issue in my chapter 6. Barnard (who agrees with a conflation theory) concludes, “This is the weakest part of Harrison’s

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 39.

<sup>18</sup> Schoedel, “Polycarp of Smyrna,” 279.

<sup>19</sup> Puech, Review, 102.

<sup>20</sup> D. K. Rensberger, “As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul’s Letters in Second-Century Christianity.” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981), 108.

<sup>21</sup> An early, scathing (and perhaps simplistic) critique is found in Headlam, “Epistle.”

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Headlam’s blunt remark: “But what support is given to one guess, by the fact that some people have made similar guesses about other books? I should say, none” (Headlam, “Epistle,” 4).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Cadoux’s refutation (Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 337 n.1).

<sup>24</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 22–23. After the first two sentences of chapter 45, a second hand has added the remainder of the work. See J. Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 2, *The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus* (Westminster, MD: 1953), 272.

<sup>25</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 24.

notable book and it seems inconceivable that he would have put it forward save for the reference to ‘a first-born of Satan.’”<sup>26</sup>

Harrison’s third argument (frequent use of the New Testament in *Phil* 1–12 but complete absence in chapters 13–14) will be covered in depth in my chapter 11. For now, Schoedel’s comment is sufficient, “The subject matter of chapters 13–14 is sufficient explanation of the relative paucity of allusions there.”<sup>27</sup> Epistolary criticism would cause one not to expect many allusions to authoritative material in a conventional letter closing.<sup>28</sup>

Fourth, almost all scholars now agree that Polycarp does not clearly quote Ignatius.<sup>29</sup> Ignatian material probably has influenced *Phil* 1–12, and chapter 11 of this study discusses some of those possible influences. Yet there are no echoes so clear that one feels “constrained to enclose them in quotation marks.”<sup>30</sup> For instance, Schoedel argues that *Phil* 1.1 (a comparison of the martyrs’ “bonds”

<sup>26</sup> Barnard, “Problem,” 35; cf. Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1684. Harnack declares, “Mit Unrecht hat man in Polykarps Brief an die Gemeinde zu Philippi (c. 6f.) eine Beziehung auf Marcion gefunden und deshalb den Brief entweder für unecht oder für interpoliert erklärt, da M. kein Häretiker der Zeit Trajans sein kann” (Harnack, *Marcion*, 5\* n.4).

<sup>27</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 39; cf. Cadoux, *Ancient Smyrna*, 269.

<sup>28</sup> Puech finds circular reasoning in the process of dating Polycarp’s “letters” through their citation of certain New Testament writings which Harrison dates late. “Cette position du problème chronologique nous met souvent dans un cercle vicieux: Ignace et Polycarpe sont chargés de témoigner de l’ancienneté de tel ou tel écrit du Nouveau Testament, et inversement” (Puech, Review, 101 n.1). Camelot further comments, “Et surtout l’hypothèse de M. Harrison semble commandée par une théorie sur la constitution du canon du Nouveau Testament (Épître de Pierre en particulier), qui nous paraît lui donner quelque chose d’arbitraire” (Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 194).

<sup>29</sup> Harrison concludes that *Phil*’s “slightly laboured allusiveness would arrest thought and stimulate pious reflection and awaken sacred memories” (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 164). Is this not another way of stating that the allusions are not always very clear? Harrison compares the term τὰ μνήματα τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἀγάπης in *Phil* 1.1 with *Romans* 6.2 <sic. 6.3> and 7.3: ἐπιτρέψατε μοι μιμητὴν εἶναι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μου . . . ἄρτον θεοῦ θέλω . . . ὃ ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος. He compares the τοὺς ἐνείλημένους τοῖς ἀγιοπρεπέσιν δεσμοῖς in *Phil* 1.1 with the δεδεμένος θεοπρεπεστάτοις δεσμοῖς of *Smyrnaeans* 11.1 and the ἐν ᾧ τὰ δεσμὰ περιφέρω, τοὺς πνευματικοὺς μαργαρίτας, ἐν οἷς γένοιτό μοι ἀναστῆναι τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν of *Ephesians* 11.2. The other “coincidences” in *ibid*, 328ff; Lightfoot *Apostolic Fathers*, I.1, 136; and Zahn, *Ignatius*, 294; are all just as tenuous.

<sup>30</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 38. See my chapter 11.

“which become the saints”<sup>31</sup> with “diadems”) is partially modeled on Ignatius’ *Smyrnaeans* 11.1 and *Ephesians* 11.2.<sup>32</sup> But Schoedel has also argued that there are weak Ignatian allusions in *Phil* 13 and 14 as well.<sup>33</sup> In the case of such allusions, there is no reason why Ignatius would not be fresh on Polycarp’s mind at a date earlier than 135, especially since Polycarp was collecting the Ignatian corpus at the time. Harrison’s contention that the allusions demonstrate years of reflection is not demonstrable.<sup>34</sup> Polycarp could have re-read the collection as he prepared to send it in 115. In fact, Corwin argues that the echoes actually weaken Harrison’s theory:

It must be said that the echoes of Ignatius’ phrases that he <Harrison> finds in Polycarp’s letter are not so easy to explain when we remember how many years had elapsed since Polycarp had sent on the letters. Even if, with Harrison, one assumes that Polycarp refreshed himself by rereading the letters, it is hard to see why he should hope that the Philippian church would recognize the allusions. Harrison maintains, rather unconvincingly, that the echoes of Ignatius’ writing make better sense if chapters 1 to 12 were written at the later date, because Polycarp knows that the Ignatian letters are thoroughly familiar to his readers, as they would not have been had they been enclosed with the covering letter. This assumes that the Philippian church knew them by heart, an unlikely supposition.<sup>35</sup>

Schoedel concludes, “. . . if the allusions to Ignatius’ letters prove anything, it is the impact that Ignatius and his letters are likely to have made on Polycarp at the time of Ignatius’ journey to Rome and his meeting in Smyrna with Polycarp.”<sup>36</sup>

Fifth, the argument of the “mature age” of Polycarp gathered from the tenor of the letter seems rather subjective. Barnard writes, “There is in fact nothing in Chs. i–xii to suggest that Polycarp is being consulted as an elder statesman who is nearing three score years and ten.”<sup>37</sup> If one calculates Polycarp’s eighty-six years at his martyrdom from his birth and places the martyrdom in A.D. 161, he would have been forty years old in 115.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, we must not bring modern

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *1 Clement* 13.3.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 10; idem, “Polycarp’s Witness,” 38.

<sup>33</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 38. Cf. his citations on 38–41.

<sup>34</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 281.

<sup>35</sup> Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 10.

<sup>36</sup> Schoedel, “Polycarp of Smyrna,” 281.

<sup>37</sup> Barnard, “Problem,” 31.

<sup>38</sup> Corwin asserts that he “could hardly have been less than 40” (Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 26). If one accepts historical evidence from the “Harris Fragments,” Polycarp was converted at the age



conceptions based upon lengthy life expectancies into ancient texts.<sup>39</sup> Ignatius exhorted the Magnesians to pay their youthful bishop the utmost respect (*Magnesians* 3.1).<sup>40</sup> Finally, the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* may explicitly relate that Polycarp was treated with all honor “even before his hairs were gray (καὶ πρὸ τῆς πολιάς).”<sup>41</sup> It is true that Ignatius counsels Polycarp, telling him to be more diligent, for instance (*Polycarp* 3.2). But Corwin comments, “He writes the entire letter to Polycarp in a mood of affectionate but authoritative guidance, although it is directed to a man already of considerable maturity.”<sup>42</sup> Though obviously a rhetorical flourish, Ignatius even writes that he hopes to be found as Polycarp’s disciple in the resurrection (*Polycarp* 7.1).

Sixth, the argument from Polycarp’s “sense of urgency” in *Phil* 13 seems odd in that he explicitly says, “if I have a convenient opportunity (ἐὰν λάβω καιρὸν εὐθετον)” (13.1). Even if we grant Harrison’s translation of “when I have convenient opportunity,”<sup>43</sup> Polycarp seems in no hurry for a man in a state of urgency. Harrison further argues that “convenient opportunity” should be translated “on the first opportunity, at the earliest possible moment,” but this is an

---

of eighteen, and he would have been fifty-eight years old in A.D. 161. If one accepts 155/156 as the martyrdom date, one naturally adds five to six years to all the ages.

<sup>39</sup> For an introduction to Roman life expectancies, see T. G. Parkin, *Demography and Roman Society* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University, 1992).

<sup>40</sup> “Now it becomes you not to presume on the youth of the bishop, but to render him all respect according to the power of God the Father, as I have heard that even the holy presbyters have not taken advantage of his youthful appearance, but yield to him in their godly prudence, yet not to him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ, to the bishop of all” (*Magnesians* 3.1; English translation in *LCL*). Barnard points to the youthful leadership of Athanasius (Barnard, “Problem,” 38).

<sup>41</sup> This is in Eusebius’ text (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.15.30); the common text has “even before his martyrdom (καὶ πρὸ τῆς μαρτυρίας)” (*Martyrdom* 13.2); see Lightfoot, *Essays*, 1893, 121.

<sup>42</sup> Corwin, *St. Ignatius*, 26.

<sup>43</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 93 n.2; italics mine. According to Thayer, this application is “irregularly” used (J. H. Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (New York: American Book Company, 1889), s.v. “ἐάν”). Ἐάν is used twice in 13.1, and the whole passage exudes an attitude of uncertain purpose: “Both you and Ignatius wrote to me that if (ἐάν) anyone was going to Syria, he should also take your letters. I will do this if (ἐάν) I have a convenient opportunity, either myself or the man whom I am sending as a representative for you and me.”

unusual translation of *καὶρὸν εὐθετον*.<sup>44</sup> Schoedel concludes, "A phrase like 'if I have a convenient opportunity' (13.1) cannot be got around."<sup>45</sup>

Seventh, Ignatius' *Romans* implies that he left Smyrna around August 24. At the earliest, he reached Philippi by September 2.<sup>46</sup> Lightfoot calculated that Ignatius' trip from Philippi to Rome would take thirty days, while Harnack estimated forty.<sup>47</sup> Both could fit within the tradition which states that Ignatius was martyred on October 17, but Harrison (who postulates about a fifty-day trip), places the martyrdom on October 25–27.<sup>48</sup>

From Polycarp's end of the equation, time must be allowed for the Philippians to write a letter to Polycarp and a letter to the church of Antioch (perhaps a few days) and to transport them to Smyrna (seven days), for Polycarp to assemble the Ignatian collection, have a copy made,<sup>49</sup> and compose his own letter (perhaps a few more days). Polycarp would have written his reply under the consideration of the time taken for *Phil* to reach Philippi (seven days).<sup>50</sup> In our analysis of the letter opening, we mentioned the possibility that Philippian members escorted Ignatius for 150 miles or more before he sent back his correspondence. This would add another twenty days. We have now moved past Lightfoot's thirty days toward Harnack's forty, without even taking into account the complete lack of urgency expressed by Polycarp in *Phil* 13. Schoedel further refers to Polycarp's "slower-moving disposition" and cites *Polycarp* 3.2, but Ignatius' rhetorical and ambiguous call for Polycarp to be "more diligent than you are" should probably

---

<sup>44</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 40.

<sup>45</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 181.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 112.

<sup>47</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 112–114. For one piece of the puzzle, see N. G. L. Hammond, "The Western Part of the Via Egnatia," *Journal of Roman Studies* 64 (1974): 185–194.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 116. Following Ramsay, he assumes (and probably rightfully so), that Ignatius was not martyred immediately upon arrival. For a fuller discussion of the time frame, see my chapter 3.

<sup>49</sup> Harrison's contention that Polycarp had the collection copied "in a few hours" "while the messenger from Philippi waited" seems rather rushed. I have argued that Polycarp had had previous contact with the Philippians. Would they not spend at least a little time enjoying his company?

<sup>50</sup> See Schoedel's reconstruction in Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 38.

not carry much evidential weight in this regard.<sup>51</sup> At any rate, sufficient time would have elapsed for Polycarp to assume Ignatius' death.<sup>52</sup>

## Developments of the Two-Letter Theory

Such counter-arguments have caused scholars to re-investigate Harrison's original hypothesis. Barnard has added another evidence for the two-letter conflation theory. In order to prove that behind the Latin *qui cum eo sunt* stands a Greek original with a present verb tense, Barnard turns to Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* III.36. It is noteworthy that Eusebius quotes chapter 9 and chapter 13 of *Phil*, but he excludes the decisive last sentence of chapter 13. Barnard argues, "Why did Eusebius omit this when he had the original Greek before him? The only feasible explanation is that he saw that in the original, Chs. ix and xiii were in dire conflict, the one recording the death of Ignatius and the other presupposing he was still alive."<sup>53</sup> Of course, there were no chapter breaks in Eusebius' Greek text,<sup>54</sup> and one may ask whether he ended his quotation before the final sentence of *our* chapter 13 for another reason. One must look at the context of Eusebius' discussion of Ignatius:

Irenaeus also knew of his martyrdom and quotes his letters saying thus: "As one of the Christians said when he was condemned to the beasts as testimony for God, 'I am the wheat of God and I am ground by the teeth of beasts that I may be found pure bread.'" Polycarp, too, mentions these same things in the letter to the Philippians bearing his name and says: "Now I beseech you all to obey the word of righteousness, and to practise all the endurance which you also saw before your eyes, not only in the blessed Ignatius, and Zosimus, and Rufus, but also in others among yourselves, and in Paul himself, and in the other Apostles; being persuaded that all of these 'ran not in vain,' but in faith and righteousness, and that they are with the Lord in the 'place which is their due,' with whom they also suffered. For they did not 'love this present world' but him who died on our behalf, and was raised by God for our

---

<sup>51</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 38; see Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 126–128.

<sup>52</sup> Of course, if one theorizes that Polycarp (urged on by Ignatius' general request for an embassy to Antioch) initiated contact with Philippi (as I discussed in my chapter 5), this extra correspondence would add more time. And if Polycarp did not yet possess copies of the Ignatian letters and had to send for them from the various churches, a lengthy postponement would naturally occur.

<sup>53</sup> Barnard, "Problem," 33.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Wake's variant chapter breaks (Wake, *Genuine Epistles*).

sakes.” And he continues later, “Both you and Ignatius wrote to me that if anyone was going to Syria he should also take your letters. I will do this if I have a convenient opportunity, either myself or the man whom I am sending as a representative for you and me. We send you, as you asked, the letters of Ignatius, which were sent to us by him, and others which we had by us. They are subjoined to this letter, and you will be able to benefit greatly from them. For they contain faith, patience, and all the edification which pertains to our Lord.” Such is the story concerning Ignatius, and Heros succeeded to the bishopric of Antioch after him (*Historia ecclesiastica* III.36; English translation in *LCL*).

From the first sentence above, one understands that Eusebius is trying to gather secondary information about the “martyrdom” and “epistles” of Ignatius. He first turns to a brief quotation from Irenaeus which both refers to the martyrdom and quotes from *Romans*. Then, Eusebius turns to Polycarp for information about the Ignatian martyrdom and letters. First, Eusebius incorporates *Phil* 9's material about the martyrdom. Then he turns to *Phil* 13 for a witness to Ignatius' epistles. It comes as no surprise, then, that he ends his quote immediately after the material about the Ignatian epistles ends. Eusebius' explicitly stated purpose in gathering the material, not Eusebius' supposed concern with the original Greek text, is thus the cause of the omission of the following sentence (which does not describe the martyrdom or the epistles). Finally, Photius not only read the epistle, but transcribed the last portion, and evidently he did not notice a contradiction in the Greek text.<sup>55</sup>

Harrison's theory has been further modified by later scholars. Cadoux, Simonin, Puech, Goodspeed, Fischer, Camelot, Barnard, Wilson, J. B. Bauer, and Berding maintain that the basic thesis of two letters is correct – it is the only feasible solution to the apparent discrepancy between chapters 9 and 13. However, they argue that Harrison's dating of the two letters is in error.<sup>56</sup> While the cover letter was written c. A.D. 115, the second letter was not written two

---

<sup>55</sup> Photius, *Bibliotheca* 126.

<sup>56</sup> Cadoux, Review, 267–270; H. D. Simonin, *Historicae disquisitiones ad doctrinam Christologicam* (Rome: Angelicum, 1938), 258–260; Puech, Review, 96–102; Fischer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 236–237; Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 194–195; Barnard, “Problem,” 31–39; J. C. Wilson, “Polycarp,” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992); Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*; Berding, “Polycarp of Smyrna's View,” 349–350.

decades afterward;<sup>57</sup> perhaps the second was written only a few years later (A.D. 120 at the latest).<sup>58</sup>

First, they point to the tenor of *Phil* 1. Polycarp commends the Philippians' treatment of Ignatius and his companions, and the context does not suggest a distant event two decades prior, but rather a memory still fresh in the Philippians' mind. The text of chapter 1 asserts,

I rejoiced with you greatly in our Lord Jesus Christ, that receiving the followers of the true Love you escorted them on their way, as opportunity was given to you – those men encircled in saintly bonds which are the diadems of those that have been truly chosen by God and our Lord.

While it is “not impossible” that Polycarp is speaking of an event twenty years earlier, it seems “more probable” that it is a “more recent event.”<sup>59</sup> Harrison's reference to “an old man dreaming of great days long gone by,” “appealing here to an incident which had passed into history” is unwarranted.<sup>60</sup> Barnard points to similar situations in Philippians 1 and the *Epistle of Barnabas* 1. Based upon *Phil* 1, Cadoux surmises that chapters 1–12 were written within two years of Ignatius' visit.<sup>61</sup> Puech echoes, “Dès lors, l'écart mis entre I–XII, d'une part, et XIII–XIV, de l'autre, se rétrécit considérablement et tend même à s'évanouir.”<sup>62</sup>

Second, Barnard argues that the moral exhortation in *Phil* 1–12 is similar to catechetical teaching found in the New Testament, the *Didache*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and earlier portions of the *Shepherd of Hermas*. Barnard concludes, “On these grounds, in view of the failure to quote the four-fold Gospel, and the fact that the formation of the New Testament Canon had begun fairly early in the second century, I should not be inclined to date Chs. i–xii of Polycarp's *Epistle* later than c. A.D. 120.”<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> For Puech, “séparer par une vingtaine d'années la première lettre de la seconde ne me paraît pas très probant” (Puech, Review, 101–102).

<sup>58</sup> J. B. Bauer extends the possible limits to the second and third decades as a whole (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 5).

<sup>59</sup> Barnard, “Problem,” 33; cf. Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 194; Puech, Review, 102.

<sup>60</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 161–162.

<sup>61</sup> Cadoux, Review, 268–270; idem, *Ancient Smyrna*, 339 n.3, 340.

<sup>62</sup> Puech, Review, 102.

<sup>63</sup> Barnard, “Problem,” 33.

Scholars have also put forward a second modification of Harrison's theory. Camelot, Puech, and others have insisted that chapter 14 better fits the later letter rather than the original cover letter,<sup>64</sup> although Harrison himself believed that chapter 14 probably belonged to the earlier cover letter.<sup>65</sup> Kleist seems uncommitted at first,<sup>66</sup> but later writes,

The whole tone of this postscript seems to indicate that it belongs at the end of this second letter, and not at the end of the covering note. For, otherwise, what is the meaning of *in praesenti* . . . if it does not imply that Crescens had on an earlier occasion brought the covering note to Philippi and during his stay there edified the whole community?<sup>67</sup>

These authors emphasize Polycarp's statement in chapter 14 that he has previously communicated with the Philippians through Crescens; this would seem to fit the second letter better, demonstrating a close relationship between the two.<sup>68</sup> But Joly has brought attention to the puzzling nature of this modified theory of conflation. This is no longer a mere merging of two documents at one seam, as Harrison had assumed. How would the cover letter be accidentally inserted between chapters 12 and 14 with its own introduction and salutations excised?

Yet Harrison's own theory of the actual act of conflation is also wanting. According to his hypothesis, both letters were kept in the same chest in Philippi. At one point, a copy was made of Polycarp's anti-Marcionite letter (the second letter, c. A.D. 135), but there was vacant space or an extra leaf at the end, so the short covering note (the first letter, c. A.D. 115) was added. Harrison continues,

Once this had happened, the rest would easily follow. It would soon be forgotten (1) why there had been that line or space between the last paragraph of the longer letter and this additional paragraph, and even (2) that there had ever been (if indeed there was at first) such a mark of division.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*; Puech, Review; Barnard follows Harrison (Barnard, "Problem," 33).

<sup>65</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Letters*, 15, 206.

<sup>66</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 71; cf. Glimm's hesitation (Glimm, "Letter," 132). Cf. Altaner: "Chapter 14, being a postscript, fits the first as well as the second letter" (Altaner, *Patrology*, 111).

<sup>67</sup> Kleist, *Didache*, 196 n.100. For an examination of *in praesenti*, see my chapter 5.

<sup>68</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 41. Fischer writes, "dafür spricht vielleicht, daß sich Polykarp in diesem Kapitel auf eine frühere Empfehlung des Crescens an die Philipper berufen kann; die covering note kann das Postskript überhaupt leichter entbehren als das lange Schreiben" (Fischer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 234f).

<sup>69</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 19.

Puech notes the lack of any such sign of welding between *Phil* 12 and 13.<sup>70</sup> More damagingly, is one to believe that Letter 2 had no letter closing, and that Letter 1 had no letter opening, so that by merely overlooking a separation mark on the papyri, they were soon seen as neatly comprising one letter?<sup>71</sup> These whittled letters would go against the tenets of epistolary criticism exhibited in the forms of even short papyri correspondence.

Clearly, Harrison's two-letter theory dominated twentieth century Polycarpian scholarship. Nevertheless, his arguments are not conclusive, and several authors have modified his theory by placing the second letter around A.D. 120 and by attaching chapter 14 to the second letter.

All of this brings up the larger question of the necessity of the two-letter theory at all.<sup>72</sup> Can the phenomena really be explained "d'un coup de ciseau ingénieux"?<sup>73</sup> Richardson opposes Harrison's theory.<sup>74</sup> Lindemann and Paulsen waver, but write that "die Möglichkeit eines Briefes erwägenswert bleibt."<sup>75</sup> Nielsen is "inclined" to accept the unity of the epistle.<sup>76</sup> Nautin argues, "the hypothesis that the present text is the result of a fusion of two primitive letters has no sufficient base."<sup>77</sup>

Dehandschutter points to the external testimony:<sup>78</sup> Irenaeus, writing around A.D. 180 only knows of one letter to the Philippians. If our text has been tampered with, it must have occurred within a few decades of Polycarp's second

<sup>70</sup> Puech, Review, 102.

<sup>71</sup> Later, Harrison briefly puts forth an alternative: whole sections of Letters 1 and 2 were bypassed when the two were conflated (even as the Greek manuscripts of *Phil* abruptly transfer to the *Epistle of Barnabas* in chap. 9). He considers this a "possibility," but it "seems rather remote" (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 22). In my opinion, this hypothesis is more credible than the one he explains in length (*ibid.*, 18–19).

<sup>72</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 4; Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 16–17.

<sup>73</sup> Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 193.

<sup>74</sup> C. C. Richardson, *Early Christian Fathers* (London: SCM, 1953), 129ff.

<sup>75</sup> Lindemann and Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 243.

<sup>76</sup> Nielsen, "Polycarp, Paul and the Scripture," 216.

<sup>77</sup> Nautin, "Polycarp." Wake's words, written prior to Harrison, may still be apropos: "For indeed, were not men willing to be contentious, where is the contradiction they so much boasted of between the two places to which I have before alluded <chap. 9 and chap. 13>?" (Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 81). Tentzelius, though he supposed *Phil* had been interpolated, did not see any contradiction between chapters 9 and 13 (see Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 82–83).

<sup>78</sup> Contra Kleist, who insists that only the internal testimony is useful (Kleist, *Didache*, 70).

letter. This seems improbable.<sup>79</sup> The external validation alone is sufficiently convincing for Bardy to accept the unity of the epistle.<sup>80</sup>

This leaves the internal evidence. Dehandschutter refers to the unity of paraenetic style and the fitting nature of chapter 13's place at the end of the epistle.<sup>81</sup> My own epistolary criticism of *Phil* revealed the flow from opening to body to closing; it is difficult to believe that two diverse letters would be so fittingly merged by mere chance. I would also add that *Phil* 13 refers to "endurance," one of the three paraenetic responses tied to the theme of "righteousness" (see my chapter 9): The letters of Ignatius "contain faith, endurance, and all the edification which pertains to our Lord."

## Chapters Nine and Thirteen

As Harrison notes, "the key is chapter 13." More specifically, the "key" is one word in the Latin translation of chapter 13. *Phil* 13 states, "Let us know if you have any more certain tidings concerning Ignatius himself and those that *are* with him (*qui cum eo sunt*)," implying that Ignatius is still alive.<sup>82</sup> Unfortunately, we do not have the original Greek text of the last sentence of chapter 13. Pearson (1672) already recognized that the Greek behind this Latin translation was probably simply τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ, without a verb.<sup>83</sup> This suggestion is supported by the Latin translator's rendition of similar constructions in the extant Greek portions. For example, the Greek inscription reads Πολύκαρπος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι which the Latin translation renders *Polycarpus et qui cum eo sunt*

---

<sup>79</sup> Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle," 277.

<sup>80</sup> G. Bardy, *Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire Ecclésiastique* (Paris: Cerf, 1960), vol. I, 180 n.6; vol. II, 63 n.8.

<sup>81</sup> Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle," 278.

<sup>82</sup> Harrison correctly castigates any attempt to read the passage as referring to "Ignatius and those who are with him <in glory> or <in the presence of the Lord>" (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 147).

<sup>83</sup> Pearson, *Vindiciae epistolarum*, II, 71–73. Cf. Lightfoot's later agreement (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 588ff). Zahn suggests the Greek for the entire phrase was καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἰγνατίου καὶ περὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ or σὺν αὐτῷ (Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 290). Harrison states that this reconstruction is "almost too easy," but indeed "fairly probable" (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 134, 137).



*presbyteri* (adding *sunt* to a verbless phrase). Chapter 3 renders the Greek τῆς ἀγάπης τῆς εἰς θεὸν as *dilectione, quae est in deo*.<sup>84</sup> The Greek of chapter 9 reads ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις τοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν which the Latin renders as *sed et in aliis qui ex vobis sunt* (once again adding *sunt* to a verbless phrase). In addition, the context in *Phil* 9 is clearly past tense: “which you *saw* before your eyes, not only in the blessed Ignatius, and Zosimus, and Rufus, *but also in others among yourselves*.” Lightfoot argues for another such instance behind the Latin *qui sunt sub caelo* in chapter 12.<sup>85</sup> If this habit holds true, then the original Greek wording of this phrase in chapter 13 was verbless as well, but the Latin translator employed the verb *sunt*. While Lightfoot’s rendition of chapter 13, “those that *were* with him” is too biased,<sup>86</sup> a more neutral translation might read, “Let us know if you know anything more certain concerning Ignatius himself *and his companions* <or *those with him*>.”<sup>87</sup> Such a translation does not necessarily imply that Ignatius is still living.

Harrison claims that *Phil* 9 proves that both Polycarp and the Philippians knew “beyond all shadow of doubt” that Ignatius had passed away.<sup>88</sup> Schoedel (followed by Dehandschutter) has critiqued Harrison’s understanding of chapter 9. Schoedel argues that the wording of chapter 9 should not be pressed into proving the accomplished death of Ignatius. Rather, Schoedel contends that the emphasis changes in 9.1 from Ignatius and his companions to Paul and the apostles. As Dehandschutter comments, “The contradiction with chapter 9 is not absolute when one interprets 9,2 (οὔτοι πάντες) with regard to the ἄλλοι ἐξ ὑμῶν,

---

<sup>84</sup> Chap. 3 further adds a verb in its translation of τῶν τότε ἀνθρώπων as *illis qui tunc erant hominibus*. Here the Latin’s verb addition obviously matches the meaning.

<sup>85</sup> Lightfoot, *Essays*, 112; idem, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 345; cf. Acts 2:5; Colossians 1:23.

<sup>86</sup> See comments in Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 137–140; Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 40. “Traduire: ‘ceux qui étaient avec lui,’ est préjuger tout autant de la situation” (Puech, Review, 100). Puech’s further contention that “Le chapitre tout entier suppose que, dans la pensée de Polycarpe, Ignace et ses compagnons sont alors encore en vie” (ibid., 100) will be addressed below.

<sup>87</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 137–138; Lightfoot recognizes this in *Essays*, 112; idem, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 349; cf. Camelot’s rendition: “Faites-nous savoir ce que vous aurez appris de sûr d’Ignace et de ses compagnons” (Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 223); and the translation of Lindemann and Paulsen: “Und was ihr Zuverlässigeres über Ignatius und seine Gefährten in Erfahrung bringt, das gebt bekannt” (Lindemann and Paulsen, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 257).

<sup>88</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 148.

Paul and the other apostles.”<sup>89</sup> In this case, the phrase “all these ran not in vain but . . . are in their due place in the presence of the Lord” refers only to the immediately preceding members of the list, namely Paul and the rest of the Apostles.

Schoedel gives three reasons. First, the term “blessed” does not necessarily refer to the dead, as Harrison argues.<sup>90</sup> Second, the phrase “before your eyes” implies a fresh memory of Ignatius and obviously would not apply to Paul and the rest of the apostles. Third, the construction “not only . . . but also” usually places greater stress on the second component. If the emphasis has changed in this sentence, then the following description of being “in their due place with the Lord” may apply only to the second members (Paul and the apostles).<sup>91</sup> Fourth, “in their due place” is an allusion to *1 Clement* 5.4, and Clement uses the phrase of Paul and Peter specifically.<sup>92</sup> “Let us set before our eyes the good apostles” (cf. *1 Clement* 44.5; *1 Clement* 47; Philippians 2:16). Based on these arguments, Schoedel maintains that Polycarp may have believed Ignatius was still alive, in spite of *Phil* 9.

While I may disagree with Schoedel’s assertion that Polycarp thought Ignatius was still alive, Schoedel does demonstrate an important point. The passage does not seem to apply the same amount of certainty to Ignatius’ death as to that of Paul and the apostles. I would add a fourth argument. One recalls that *Phil* 9 is an example of *paradeigmata*, frequent in paraenetic literature. The common form of positive *paradeigmata* involved a recalling of the character, an explanation of the character’s display of the desired trait, and a description of the rewarding results. One clearly finds this repeated structure in *1 Clement* 9–12. For example,

---

<sup>89</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 278.

<sup>90</sup> Delehay, *Sanctus*, 59–72.

<sup>91</sup> Although obviously not replying to Schoedel (who wrote three decades later), Harrison asserts, “To maintain that Ignatius was tacitly excepted from this list of martyred saints, or that the inclusion was due to inadvertence on the part of its writer, is clearly impossible. Polycarp would not consciously write nonsense, nor was his memory so weak that he could forget before his sentence was half-written the name that heads this roll of honour” (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 144).

<sup>92</sup> See Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 29; See also *1 Clement* 5.3: “Let us set before our eyes the good apostles.” Harrison nods at the Clementine parallel (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 148 n.1).

Let us fix our gaze on those who have rendered perfect service to his excellent glory. Let us take Enoch, who was found righteous in obedience, and was translated, and death did not befall him. Noah was found faithful in his service, in foretelling a new beginning to the world, and through him the Master saved the living creatures which entered in concord into the Ark (*1 Clement* 9.2–4; English translation in *LCL*).

Similarly, *1 Clement* 5.1–7 exemplifies the form in regard to Peter and Paul specifically:

But to cease from the examples of old time, let us come to those who contended in the days nearest to us; let us take the noble examples of our own generation. Through jealousy and envy the greatest and most righteous pillars of the Church were persecuted and contended unto death. Let us set before our eyes the good apostles: Peter, who because of unrighteous jealousy suffered not one or two but many trials, and having thus given his testimony went to the glorious place which was his due. Through jealousy and strife Paul showed the way to the prize of endurance; seven times he was in bonds, he was exiled, he was stoned, he was a herald both in the East and in the West, he gained the noble fame of his faith, he taught righteousness to all the world, and when he had reached the limits of the West he gave his testimony before the rulers, and thus passed from the world and was taken up into the Holy Place, – the greatest example of endurance (English translation in *LCL*).

The problem for Polycarp arises in that no visible rewards had yet come from Ignatius' endurance. In order to persuade the audience with the formulaic "rewarding results," Polycarp had to make a generality that did not (yet) necessarily apply to all the parties involved. Attention to form criticism, therefore, buttresses the view that Polycarp assumed Ignatius' martyrdom was accomplished or imminent but was not certain of the details.

Does this contradict chapter 13? Not necessarily. Polycarp merely requests, "Moreover let us know what you know *certainly* (*certius*) of Ignatius and his companions." He explicitly refers to material which the Philippians may know "more certainly (*certius*)."<sup>93</sup> Polycarp assumes that more specific news will reach

---

<sup>93</sup> See Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 290. Barnard contends that "Polycarp's enquiry for further information covers any interesting facts which the Philippians may have known about the earlier stages of the journey when they had accompanied Ignatius." Pearson, followed by Harrison, argues that the news would cover both their accompaniment and details from Rome (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 36, 140). But in my reconstruction, the Philippians' original letter would not have been sent until those who accompanied Ignatius returned to Philippi; naturally, it would have contained any news they experienced firsthand. The tenor of the passage seems to fit better with any certain news the Philippians had *heard* more certainly, not what they *saw* while personally accompanying Ignatius. Cf. Lake's translation: "Let us know anything

Philippi before Smyrna, as the future perfect indicative *agnoveritis* in 13.1 implies.<sup>94</sup> Though he has assumed the bishop's death, he wishes to receive any further details the Philippians would have acquired. Polycarp may have written before news of Ignatius' death had arrived but after "it might reasonably be held that he had been martyred."<sup>95</sup>

Harrison's biggest problem seems to be that he is caught in a logical conundrum: either Ignatius must be dead or he must be alive – he cannot be both.<sup>96</sup> Harrison seems to forget that we must approach *Phil* from the perspective of a writer in Smyrna writing to Philippi, not from the perspective of actual events in Rome.<sup>97</sup> Harrison's dilemma sounds unimpeachable when approached from the actual events in Rome, but it is actually a mere chimera when compared with the condition in which Polycarp found himself in Smyrna. Both Polycarp and the Philippians had sent Ignatius on his way to martyrdom, and when Ignatius disappeared over the horizon, he was "as good as dead."<sup>98</sup> Polycarp and the Philippians would not fret over whether Ignatius had actually passed away by this specific calendar day – he had left them on a journey toward a certain death.<sup>99</sup>

---

further which you have heard about Ignatius himself and those who are with him" (Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 301).

<sup>94</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 15, 140.

<sup>95</sup> Headlam, "Epistle of Polycarp," 7.

<sup>96</sup> Observe the list of alternatives in Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 133, 143.

<sup>97</sup> See his chapter on "The Crux of the Problem" (*ibid.*, 72–75). According to Harrison, if *Phil* is to be a unity, the interpreter must be able to fit it into "one particular moment" in "the life-story of Ignatius and of Polycarp." But while the interpreter must indeed fit *Phil* with Polycarp's (the author's) perspective, he is not constrained to know a situation in Ignatius' life which Polycarp did not know either.

<sup>98</sup> For this reason, there is no need to be pigeonholed into Harrison's contrast between those interpreters who believed Ignatius was still alive (interpreters before Pearson, as well as Harnack and Batiffol) and those who believed Ignatius was dead (most defenders of unity since Pearson). Once again, the point is not whether Ignatius, in Rome, was dead or alive. *Phil* was written from the perspective of a friend and fellow ecclesiastical leader "left in the dark" in Smyrna.

<sup>99</sup> Harrison's attempt to emphasize "the inherent uncertainty of human affairs," because "you never know," since "the unexpected happens," sounds like special pleading.

## Plausibility of Unity

A similar reconstruction was argued before Harrison's study.<sup>100</sup> "From whence it appears, that though he supposed that Ignatius by that time might have suffered, yet he had not received any certain account of it, but was still to learn the manner and circumstances of his passion."<sup>101</sup> However, due to Harrison's work, this view seems to have been abandoned (though Nautin and Paulsen appear to sympathize with it).<sup>102</sup> Harrison caricatured and dismissed such an idea as a far-fetched hypothesis that was only forcefully placed upon the evidence due to the apparent discrepancy between chapters 9 and 13.<sup>103</sup> If Polycarp had already assumed Ignatius' death, why would he desire the details, unless he were merely interested in gore! Barnard agrees that the explanation is "altogether too simple."<sup>104</sup> Of course, any solution to the problem (including Harrison's) is hypothetical and a "simple" solution is not necessarily inferior. In lieu of the *simpler* unity hypothesis (and its textual and early external support), one must question the *necessity* of a more complex two-letter conflation theory. There is no textual evidence for two letters, and our earliest external witness (Irenaeus) knew nothing of two letters. Furthermore, my previous chapters have demonstrated that the entire epistle can be reasonably interpreted as a unified whole.<sup>105</sup>

In addition, the reconstruction argued here may not "far-fetched" at all. How could Polycarp assume Ignatius' death without having heard details? We must remember how certain Ignatius himself felt about his imminent martyrdom, how

---

<sup>100</sup> Pearson, *Vindiciae epistolarum*, 64–82; Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 80; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 349: "This letter of Polycarp must have been written shortly after the death of Ignatius, and before the particulars of his martyrdom had reached Smyrna."

<sup>101</sup> Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 80.

<sup>102</sup> Nautin, "Polycarp"; Paulsen, *Die Briefe*, 111–112.

<sup>103</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 73–75. Schoedel wrote, "But it still seems artificial to suggest that in 13.2 Polycarp was inquiring into further details about the journey or martyrdom of (the now dead) Ignatius" (Schoedel, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 277).

<sup>104</sup> Barnard, "Problem," 32.

<sup>105</sup> In this I disagree with Harrison, who believed that "every part of the Epistle" cannot "be satisfactorily explained as having been written at one particular moment" (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 74).

he eagerly awaited it, and how he actually entreated the Roman Christians not to prevent it:<sup>106</sup>

Suffer me to be eaten by the beasts, through whom I can attain to God. I am God's wheat, and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found pure bread of Christ. Rather entice the wild beasts that they may become my tomb, and leave no trace of my body, that when I fall asleep I be not burdensome to any. Then shall I be truly a disciple of Jesus Christ, when the world shall not even see my body. Beseech Christ on my behalf, that I may be found a sacrifice through these instruments (*Romans* 4.1–2; English translation in *LCL*).<sup>107</sup>

Ignatius told the Romans that if they attempted to prevent his martyrdom, it would only be “an unseasonable kindness” (*Romans* 4.1). Lake contends that this is a partial quotation from the proverb preserved by Zenobius: “An unseasonable kindness is nothing different from hostility.”<sup>108</sup> For Polycarp not to assume Ignatius' martyrdom would have been to rob Ignatius of his crowning achievement. Wake adds that perhaps Polycarp was assuming Ignatius' death based upon a computation of his arrival in Rome or of the solemn festival there at which gladiator fights were common.<sup>109</sup>

But if Polycarp had assumed Ignatius' martyrdom, why would he desire details? Did he have a sadistic interest in blood and gore, as Harrison caricatured? The explicitly parallel example of a somewhat contemporary document has been overlooked by scholars: the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*. Chapter 20 of this letter, written by the church of Smyrna to the church of Philomelium, states,

You asked, it is true, for a more detailed account of the events, but for the present we are giving you only a summary report through the good offices of our brother Marcion. Take

---

<sup>106</sup> Laeuchli's psychological study had referred to Ignatius' “pathological state of mind” (S. Laeuchli, “The Drama of Replay,” in *Searching in the Syntax of Things* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 69–126). Tanner countered by placing Ignatius' frame of mind in its philosophical context (R. G. Tanner, “Martyrdom in Saint Ignatius of Antioch and the Stoic View of Suicide,” *Studia Patristica* 16 (1985): 201–205).

<sup>107</sup> Eusebius summarized Ignatius' entire *Epistle to the Romans* in this manner: “In addition to these <epistles> he also wrote to the church at Rome, and to it he extended the request that they should not deprive him of the hope for which he longed by begging him off from his martyrdom” (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III.36).

<sup>108</sup> Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 231. Though Ignatius' determination may seem morbid, one must remember that he was being forced to adjust himself to his impending and cruel death throughout his weeks of travel (Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 14).

<sup>109</sup> Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 81–82.

note, then, of the contents and forward the letter to the brethren farther on. They too, should glorify the Lord, who makes his choice from among his servants.<sup>110</sup>

From this passage we gather: (1) The church of Philomelium knew of Polycarp's death in general.<sup>111</sup> (2) The church of Philomelium had asked for a more detailed account, and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* is a preliminary reply to this request, a provisionally brief narrative.<sup>112</sup> The Philomelians' desire for detailed information is manifested in that although the *Martyrdom* narrates "the most minute particulars," the writer still states he has only described the events "summarily."<sup>113</sup> (3) The church of Smyrna expected the church of Philomelium to forward this letter to churches further away.

Similarly, Polycarp may have (1) assumed Ignatius' inescapable martyrdom and yet<sup>114</sup> (2) asked for further details; and (3) presumed that the Philippians, who were closer to Rome, would have received news earlier than he, which they could forward to those further away. During this season of winter, when adverse weather halted sea navigation, news from Rome would pass through Macedonia in order to reach Asia Minor.<sup>115</sup>

As the *Martyrdom* evidences, asking for details about a death which one has assumed or only cursorily heard of is not necessarily "far-fetched." Thus, this reconstruction of *Phil* does not seem all that unusual. Even today, purely on the level of human instinct, when a close friend or family member dies, it is natural to request further information concerning the circumstances and details of the

---

<sup>110</sup> Donaldson argues that this section of the *Martyrdom* was interpolated; his conclusion seems unwarranted and has not won wide support (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 204–205). Why would an interpolator choose the damaged-by-association name of Marcion?

<sup>111</sup> Some have even suggested that the Phrygian Quintus who was also martyred at Smyrna was actually from Philomelium, but this is beyond proof (Kleist, *Didache*, 85; cf. A. Lelong, *Les Pères Apostoliques*, 2nd ed., vol. 3 (Paris: Picard, 1927), lx).

<sup>112</sup> Streeter, *Primitive Christianity*, 271.

<sup>113</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 210–211.

<sup>114</sup> It is not necessary to suppose, with Pearson, that Polycarp had tidings but not details (Pearson, *Vindiciae Epistolarum*, 91–93).

<sup>115</sup> Lightfoot, *Essays*, 93.

passing away.<sup>116</sup> When one encounters the heroic witness of a venerable martyr, the tendency may be undeniable.

## Summary

Harrison's theory has dominated twentieth century scholarship. However, many of his arguments seem weak. If one does hypothesize two letters, it seems better to date the second letter before A.D. 120.<sup>117</sup> If so, then Polycarp's evidence concerning New Testament documents must also be dated to this time. Beyond this, however, the two-letter hypothesis is not necessary at all. It is built upon the vulnerable Latin translation of the Greek original. The case of the unity of the epistle is the *simpler* solution, and if accepted, the entire letter can be dated to c. A.D. 115.

In addition to Schoedel's call for a careful reading of *Phil* 9, I have employed form criticism to lessen the contrast between chapters 9 and 13. I have also brought forth *Martyrdom* 20 as a witness to the possibility of assuming death while requesting further details. And I have used the theme of *Phil*, epistolary criticism, and Polycarp's situational horizon in Smyrna to bolster the probability of unity.

Based upon the unity of the epistle, one may date the entirety of *Phil* within a year of Ignatius' journey through Philippi. I have already referred to the dating of this event within the reign of the emperor Trajan, probably not before A.D. 110 and definitely not after his death in 117 (see my chapter 3). If Ignatius' arrest is tied to Trajan's eastern trip in 114, we may place the composition of *Phil* more precisely around 115.<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> Kleist, who does not maintain the unity of the epistle, suggests that this "natural desire" led to the composition of the *Acta Martyrum* which were the forerunners of modern journals giving news from foreign mission fields! (Kleist, *Didache*, 185 n.4).

<sup>117</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 88.

<sup>118</sup> Wake dates the letter at the end of 116 or the beginning of 117 (Wake, *Genuine Epistles*, 81); Duchesne and Ayer are inclined to 115 (L. Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church*, vol. 1 (New York: Longmans, Green, 1926), 65; J. C. Ayer, *A Source Book for Ancient Church History* (New York: Scribner's, 1941), 17). Goodspeed dates the letter between 107 and 117 (E. J. Goodspeed, *The Formation of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1926), 33–34). Andrews is content with an estimation between 112 and 118 (Andrews, "Polycarp").



## Chapter 11

### New Testament Allusions in *Philippians*

In the previous chapters, I have attempted to interpret *Phil* in its own context without using it as proof in other debates. Having laid the foundation of *Phil*'s background, rhetoric, theme, and unity, we may now turn to its incorporation of New Testament documents.

#### Examples of Past Studies

Funk finds sixty-eight reminiscences of New Testament passages in *Phil*.<sup>1</sup> I find many of Funk's examples to be highly questionable, but *Phil* definitely borrows frequently from the New Testament works. Which New Testament documents does Polycarp glean for such a multitude of quotations and allusions? Lightfoot's 1889 investigation, the Oxford Committee's 1905 work, Harrison's 1936 examination, Marshall's 1950 thesis, and Schoedel's 1967 commentary all disagree on the books used by Polycarp.<sup>2</sup>

Lightfoot maintained that there were six "close" quotations from Matthew, two from Mark, three from Luke, two from Acts, two from Romans, four from 1 Corinthians, three from 2 Corinthians, two from Galatians, three from Ephesians, two from Philippians, two from 2 Thessalonians, three from 1 Timothy, two from 2 Timothy, nine from 1 Peter, and one from 1 John.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, vol. 1, 573ff.

<sup>2</sup> Other lists of New Testament books used by Polycarp can be found in the following: Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 244ff. Salmon, "Polycarpus"; Barnard, "Problem," 35–36; Wilson, "Polycarp"; Grant, *Formation*, 97; idem, "Polycarp," 145; Berding, "Polycarp of Smyrna's View," 352–355; and the marginal references in Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 282–301.

<sup>3</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 522–523. When Lightfoot included "resemblances," he drew the following conclusions: Matthew – 8, Mark – 2, Luke – 3, John – 1, Acts – 6, Romans – 5, 1 Corinthians – 5, 2 Corinthians – 5, Galatians – 5, Ephesians – 4, Philippians – 6, Colossians – 2, 2 Thessalonians – 2, 1 Timothy – 9, 2 Timothy – 2, Hebrews – 2, 1 Peter – 14, 1 John – 2.

The Oxford Committee used a system of classes to distinguish the probability of quotations. Class A included books that were used beyond “reasonable doubt.” Class B included those works of a “high degree of probability.” Class C comprised those books of a “lower degree of probability.” Class D was made up of works whose use was “too uncertain to allow any reliance to be placed upon it.”<sup>4</sup> Overall, they were much more cautious than Lightfoot. They placed 1 Corinthians and 1 Peter in Class A; Romans, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, and 2 Timothy in Class B; John, Acts, Hebrews, and 1 John in Class C; and Colossians in Class D. The Oxford Committee found no certain use of the synoptic gospels in *Phil*, only use of synoptic tradition.

Marshall argued that *Phil* uses twenty-three New Testament works. This list includes the entire New Testament canon, except Titus, Philemon, 3 John, and Revelation.<sup>5</sup>

Schoedel writes,

Only where I was fairly certain that Polycarp reflects more or less direct contact with the texts involved have I made use of quotation marks. By this criterion the following books may be listed as attested to: Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Tobit, Matthew, Luke, Acts, Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1–2 Timothy, 1 Peter, 1 John; 1 Clement. The use of the Old Testament is slight; the case of Acts (p. 8) and that of 1 John (p. 24) are perhaps doubtful; Polycarp seems to have been particularly familiar with 1 Clement. There is no evidence that any of the New Testament books are regarded as Scripture.<sup>6</sup>

One readily recognizes the vast spectrum of opinions: from Schoedel, who contends that *Phil* may only use thirteen New Testament works (two of which he considers doubtful), to Marshall, who argues that *Phil* uses twenty-three.

---

<sup>4</sup> Oxford Society of Historical Theology, *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905), iii. The committee acknowledged that dotted lines separated the categories: “It is obvious that the distinction of classes, especially between b and c, must often have involved delicate and doubtful deliberation; for it is extremely difficult, where several are collaborating, to retain at all times the same standard of judgement” (ibid., v).

<sup>5</sup> Marshall, “Use,” 44.

<sup>6</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 4–5.

## Finding Quotations and Allusions

This issue is clouded by the fact that Polycarp tends to freely use his sources, so that one must ask whether he is using New Testament literature or oral, catechetical materials. The problem involves Polycarp's loose method of quotation.<sup>7</sup> As Dehandschutter notes, "There are a lot of reminiscences which indicate Polycarp's acquaintance with many early Christian books, without its being possible to trace them to one specific passage."<sup>8</sup> Farkasfalvy theorizes, "we must realize that before the canonical status of the New Testament books became established it is anachronistic to expect that they be quoted *verbatim*."<sup>9</sup> According to Farkasfalvy, early Christian authors were summoning not so much specific texts as the apostolic message and authority. On the other hand, Polycarp loosely quotes the Old Testament in the same way (in his few allusions to the Old Testament).<sup>10</sup>

Polycarp's habit of loose quotation demonstrates that he usually quoted from memory and that he felt free to creatively edit his sources. The Oxford Society of Historical Theology postulates, "The quotations have the appearance of having been made from memory; rarely, if ever, from a book."<sup>11</sup> Barnett adds, "There is some tendency to exactness in the shorter citations, but the general tendency is toward freedom. He compresses, conflates, omits, and alters the order to suit his own purposes."<sup>12</sup> This adaptation of sources demonstrates Polycarp's creativity, not a lack of mental agility.

This habit of quoting loosely leaves one in a shadow of ambiguity: is Polycarp's source in any specific instance (1) a book, (2) his own recollection of a passage from a book, (3) someone else's allusion to a book, (3) or his own

---

<sup>7</sup> The convention of using sources loosely and without citing them was of course common in the ancient world (Grant, *Formation*, 132).

<sup>8</sup> Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle," 280.

<sup>9</sup> Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 169 n.61.

<sup>10</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 84.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 84.

<sup>12</sup> A. E. Barnett, *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1941), 171; cf. Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 84.

recollection of an oral source?<sup>13</sup> For example, Barnard argues that Polycarp is often using catechetical materials, not New Testament literature directly.<sup>14</sup>

What constraints can be placed upon finding “echoes” of one text within another? Beker questions, “when are echoes whispers, when trumpets, when muffled, subliminal sounds?”<sup>15</sup> If the author does not explicitly cite his source (for example, “it is written . . .”) and if the quotation is not verbatim, how certain can we be of the allusion at all? Hayes terms this the “vanishing point” problem:

As we move farther away from overt citation, the source recedes into the discursive distance, the intertextual relations become less determinate, and the demand placed on the reader’s listening powers grows greater. As we near the vanishing point of the echo, it inevitably becomes difficult to decide whether we are really hearing an echo at all, or whether we are only conjuring things out of the murmurings of our own imaginations.<sup>16</sup>

In other words, in our case, one wants to insure that supposed allusions in *Phil* were in Polycarp’s head, not merely the interpreter’s!<sup>17</sup> Hays has fashioned seven tests for hearing “echoes” within texts: availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation, and satisfaction.<sup>18</sup> Elsewhere, he warns us that “These tests should not, however, be applied in a mechanical fashion.”<sup>19</sup> Beker finds Fishbane’s two criteria for haggadic exegesis more satisfying than Hays’ criteria: explicit citation and density of occurrence.<sup>20</sup> On the other hand, Hayes finds his own criteria to be “more extensive and nuanced” than Fishbane’s.<sup>21</sup> Thompson has developed eleven markers of

<sup>13</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 110, 119.

<sup>14</sup> Barnard, “Problem,” 36–37.

<sup>15</sup> J. C. Beker, “Echoes and Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul’s Theology,” in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 64.

<sup>16</sup> R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 23.

<sup>17</sup> Derrett muses, “The sixty-eighth edition of a text will identify more than did the sixty-seventh” (J. D. M. Derrett, “Scripture and Norms in the Apostolic Fathers,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.27.1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 656).

<sup>18</sup> Hays, *Echoes*, 29–32.

<sup>19</sup> Idem, “*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*: Abstract,” in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 43.

<sup>20</sup> Beker, “Echoes,” 64. See M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

<sup>21</sup> R. B. Hays, “On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*,” in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (Sheffield: JSOT,

allusions, but Porter rejoins that “not only does his method appear to be subjective, but it also proves to be virtually unworkable.”<sup>22</sup> Porter negatively critiques Hays’ method as confusing the determination of echoes and the interpretation of echoes.<sup>23</sup> Because of such difficulties, I will not directly borrow a previous scholar’s methodologies; instead, I will propose my own.

My task involves less in the area of echoes, and more in the realm of quotations and allusions, but objective criteria are still important.<sup>24</sup> Quotations seem rather straight-forward (at least at first glance). But allusions can be more problematic. For the sake of our investigation of *Phil*, I propose five tests for demonstrating instances of the use of the New Testament in Polycarp: verbal quantity (is there a large percentage of verbal parallelism between *Phil* and the proposed source?); density (do similarities between the two works occur frequently within the section?); recurrence (are similarities found elsewhere in *Phil*?); singularity (is the proposed source the only possible origin, or it possible that *Phil* borrows from other similar material?); and formulaic introduction (is it introduced in a conventional way?).

## Non-New Testament Material

Grant comments that the Old Testament was “practically unknown” to Polycarp.<sup>25</sup> But an “exceedingly limited use” of the Hebrew Scriptures is not the same as

---

1993), 85. This essay by Hays is included in a collection of various responses to his previously published work

<sup>22</sup> S. Porter, “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology,” in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1997), 87. See M. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1–15.13* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 28–36.

<sup>23</sup> Porter, “Use,” 82–84. For methodologies in the determination of echoes, see D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 11–23; C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

<sup>24</sup> For the difficulty in modern scholarship of differentiating quotations, allusions, and echoes, see *ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> Grant, “Polycarp of Smyrna,” 145.

complete absence.<sup>26</sup> Nevertheless, Nielsen jokes that Polycarp's knowledge of the Old Testament "is not such that anyone would care to enter him in a Bible contest."<sup>27</sup> Grant compares *Phil* 10.3 with Isaiah 52:5, and *Phil* 11.2 with Jeremiah 5:4, besides *Phil* 10.2 with Tobit 4:10, 12:9. He also draws a possible parallel between *Phil* 6.1 and Proverbs 3:4.<sup>28</sup>

The Oxford Committee concludes that *Phil* 12:2 "undoubtedly" alludes to Jeremiah 5:4.<sup>29</sup> The committee considers Polycarp's quotation of Tobit to be even clearer. *Phil* 10.2 cautions, "When ye are able to do good, do not postpone it, because almsgiving frees from death." Most commentators agree that the second half of this verse comes from Tobit 4:10/12:9.<sup>30</sup>

Donaldson contends that Polycarp also quotes twice from the Psalms,<sup>31</sup> and Schoedel claims that "language derived directly or indirectly from the Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Tobit, and other biblical books are found" in *Phil*.<sup>32</sup> But the individual instances are sometimes rather weak. For example, *Phil* 2.1 refers to Jesus having "a throne at his right hand," which may allude to Psalm 110:1, but this text had already been frequently incorporated within confessional and other materials, and Polycarp may have received it second-hand.<sup>33</sup> Bovon-Thurneysen states that *Phil* 2.1 cites Psalm 150:6. But, as she herself recognizes, the phrase may be borrowed from confessional sources, and not directly from the Hebrew Scriptures.<sup>34</sup> *Phil* 12.1 matches the Septuagint version of Psalm 4:4, but the excerpt also appears in Ephesians 4:26. Similarly, *Phil* 10.3 is similar to Isaiah 52:5, but Ignatius had already subsumed this text (*Trallians* 8.2).<sup>35</sup> In sum,

---

<sup>26</sup> Barnett, *Paul*, 170.

<sup>27</sup> Nielsen, "Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures," 203.

<sup>28</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 105. Obviously, various interpreters classify *Phil*'s use of Tobit as use of the "Old Testament," although this is not the traditional Protestant view.

<sup>29</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 84.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 84; cf. Grant, *Formation*, 43; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 339.

<sup>31</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolic Fathers*, 242–243.

<sup>32</sup> Schoedel, "Polycarp, Epistle of"; cf. *idem*, *Polycarp*, 5.

<sup>33</sup> Schoedel acknowledges this (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 10).

<sup>34</sup> Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik," 243. The context in *Phil* 2.1 seems to be a weaving of confessional statements. The liturgical source would be a non-canonical one, since Psalm 150:6 is not cited in the New Testament. *Phil* 2.1 seems to be a catena of confessional phrases.

<sup>35</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 46.

only Polycarp's allusions to Jeremiah and Tobit clearly pass my test of "singularity."

Polycarp's use of *1 Clement* has been well-established.<sup>36</sup> Grant comments that he "knew it practically by heart."<sup>37</sup> Streeter notes that Polycarp is "more influenced by the language of Clement than by any book of the New Testament, except perhaps 1 Peter."<sup>38</sup> For example, one could compare *Phil.* 9.2 with *1 Clement* 5.4, *Phil* 5.2 with *1 Clement* 21.1, *Phil* 5.3 with *1 Clement* 1.3, *Phil* 9.2 with *1 Clement* 5.4 (and 5.6–7), and *Phil* 11.4 with *1 Clement* 37.5, as well as unusual words such as ἀγιοπρεπέσιν (cf. *Phil* 1.1 with *1 Clement* 13.3)<sup>39</sup>, ἐγκχύπτειτε (cf. *Phil* 3.2 with *1 Clement* 45.2), and παντεπόπτην (*Phil* 7.2 with *1 Clement* 55.6; 64.1). The recurrence of similarities is "beyond what can fairly be set down as accidental."<sup>40</sup> Berding finds an additional cluster of *1 Clement* allusions in *Phil* 4.2–3.<sup>41</sup> Bardenhewer has even theorized that *1 Clement* served as a direct example for Polycarp, and Grant hypothesizes that Polycarp kept a copy of *1 Clement* in Smyrna which Ignatius then used for his letters.<sup>42</sup> Such conjectures may go beyond the evidence, but Polycarp's incorporation of Clementine material cannot be questioned.

Grant asserts,

At the same time, Polycarp clearly differentiates the apostolic age from his own time and, presumably for this reason, does not use the letters of Ignatius as authorities – even though they "contain faith, endurance, and all the edification which pertains to our Lord" (13:2).<sup>43</sup>

The Ignatian epistles may not be cited authoritatively, but, on any view, there is nothing chronologically impossible about Polycarp using them. It seems to me that though Polycarp never directly quotes Ignatius' letters, a plurality of loose

---

<sup>36</sup> "Polykarpus hat bei Abfassung seines Philipperbriefes unverkennbar den Brief des hl. Klemens vor Augen gehabt und stillschweigend von demselben Gebrauch gemacht" (O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, (Freiburg: Herder, 1902), vol. 1, 102). See also F. X. Funk, *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901), xxvii–xxviii.

<sup>37</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 23.

<sup>38</sup> Streeter, *Primitive Church*, 153.

<sup>39</sup> See my chapter 7 for a fuller comparison of *Phil* 1 with *1 Clement* 1.

<sup>40</sup> Salmon, "Polycarpus." Donaldson's view that we cannot assume Polycarp knew *1 Clement* is definitely peculiar (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 231).

<sup>41</sup> Berding, "Polycarp of Smyrna's View," 354.

<sup>42</sup> Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, vol. 1, 167; Grant, *Formation*, 23.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 106.

allusions adds weight to Ignatian influence on his letter.<sup>44</sup> For example, ὑποτασσομένους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνους ὡς θεῷ καὶ Χριστῷ (*Phil* 5.3) echoes *Magnesians* 2, 6.1; *Trallians* 3.1; and *Smyrnaeans* 8.1 (cf. *Phil* 6.1 with *Polycarp* 4.1; see also chapter 10 of this study). Yet most of the seeming allusions lack verbal parallelism. For example, *Phil* 6.3 speaks of τῶν ἐν ὑποκρίσει φερόντων τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου, but *Ephesians* 7 refers to τινες δόλῳ πονηρῷ τὸ ὄνομα περιφέρειν. If Polycarp usually cited from memory, he did not yet have time to completely digest the Ignatian letters which he had just recently collected.

### Pauline Material

Polycarp's use of 1 Corinthians, Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians have been almost universally accepted. 1 Corinthians 6:2 is clearly referred to in *Phil* 11.2, and Romans 14:10–12 is clearly used in *Phil* 6.2. Various other minor correspondences with 1 Corinthians and Romans are found throughout *Phil*. Polycarp begins a quotation from Ephesians with εἰδότες ὅτι (1.3) and one from Galatians with εἰδότες ὅτι (5.3). My test of "formulaic introduction" applies in these two cases. Because Polycarp refers to Paul's epistle to the Philippians but does not quote it, Lindemann infers that he may not have known the letter itself.<sup>45</sup> But by comparing *Phil* 9.2 and Philippians 2:16; *Phil* 2.1 and Philippians 2:10; *Phil* 12.3 and Philippians 3:18; *Phil* 1.1 and Philippians 2:17;<sup>46</sup> *Phil* 5.2 and Philippians 1:27, the Oxford Committee concluded that "the general impression in favour of his acquaintance with it is stronger than can be fairly estimated from the isolated examination of single passages."<sup>47</sup> This data corresponds to my test of "recurrence." Dependence on 2 Corinthians should also be categorized as "probable" (*Phil* 2.2 and 2 Corinthians 4:14 <quite similar, but perhaps could come from confessional material; see Ignatius, *Trallians* 9.2>; *Phil* 4.1 and 2

<sup>44</sup> For a short list, see Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 136; see also *ibid.*, II.3, 321–350.

<sup>45</sup> Lindemann, "Paul," 44.

<sup>46</sup> Grant maintains that the reference to their "firmly rooted faith, which was famous in past years," and "still flourishes and bears fruit" in *Phil* 1.2 is "probably another echo" of Philippians 4:15–17 (Grant, *Formation*, 103).

<sup>47</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 94. Cf. Grant, *Formation*, 103; Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 322; Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 291–292.



Corinthians 6.7 <"weapons of righteousness">; *Phil* 6.1 and 2 Corinthians 8:21; *Phil* 6.2 and 2 Corinthians 5:10 <"the βῆμα seat of Christ," where Romans 14:10 has "the βῆμα seat of God">). Weaker evidence exists that Polycarp knew 2 Thessalonians (*Phil* 11.3 and 2 Thessalonians 1:4; *Phil* 11.4 and 2 Thessalonians 3:15) There is not sufficient evidence that Polycarp knew Colossians<sup>48</sup> or 1 Thessalonians.

Polycarp's use of the Pastoral Epistles has been heavily debated.<sup>49</sup> Kümmel argues, "Linguistic similarities to the Pastorals in Ignatius and Polycarp do not in any way prove dependence on these letters but only that they all stand in the same ecclesiastical and cultural tradition."<sup>50</sup> Along these lines, Dibelius and Conzelmann have gathered many parallels to 1 Timothy 6:7, 10;<sup>51</sup> i.e., Dio Chrysostom, *Oration* 17: "So I maintain in regard to covetousness too, that all men do know it is neither expedient nor honourable, but the cause of the greatest evils."<sup>52</sup>

Both *Phil* 5.2 and 1 Timothy 3:8 warn against deacons who are δόλογοι. *Phil* 11.3 begins with a sentence "structurally and to some extent materially parallel to 1 Timothy 3:5".<sup>53</sup> "Indeed how is he who cannot govern himself in these things to prescribe it to another." Lightfoot contends that the call for prayer for kings in *Phil* 12.3 echoes 1 Timothy 2:2.<sup>54</sup> Such allusions are relatively weak.

A stronger argument can be gathered from *Phil* 4.1:

---

<sup>48</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 101. Grant contends he "may" know Colossians (Grant, *Formation*, 104). Harrison attempts to make the most of it, but I do not find him convincing (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 293–294).

<sup>49</sup> Often dating presuppositions of the Pastorals enter into the fray. Barnett writes that "the Pastorals seem to belong to the atmosphere of the sectarian conflicts of the middle of the second century and after, which, of course precludes any use of them in Polycarp's letter to the Philippians" (Barnett, *Paul*, 183).

<sup>50</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, 370.

<sup>51</sup> M. Dibelius and H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles*, trans. P. Buttolph and A. Yarbro (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 84–86. See also the Jewish and Greco-Roman examples in Grant, "Polycarp," 145.

<sup>52</sup> English translation in Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 156.

<sup>53</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 32.

<sup>54</sup> This phrase has been used to date both 1 Timothy and *Phil* to the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (Hilgenfeld, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 273–274). Obviously, one should not read too much into the plural; the phrase may exhort Christians to pray for rulers in general. Cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 56–57.

But the beginning of all evils is the love of money. Knowing therefore that we brought nothing into the world and we can take nothing out of it, let us arm ourselves with the armour of righteousness, and let us first of all teach ourselves to walk in the commandment of the Lord.

Dibelius argues that this passage alludes to neither 1 Timothy 6:7 nor 1 Timothy 6:10. Rather, Polycarp and the Pastorals independently used material common in moral exhortation of the time.<sup>55</sup> But one notices, first of all, that an allusion to 1 Timothy 6:7 is closely aligned with an allusion from 1 Timothy 6:10. This corresponds to my test of “density.” If we adopted Dibelius’ theory that Polycarp borrowed from common diatribe, “we would be forced to assume that Polycarp and 1 Timothy were both in touch with a tradition that joined the two themes.”<sup>56</sup> Second, one realizes that the wording (especially of the second allusion) is very similar (my test of “verbal quantity”). Third, the second allusion is introduced with the phrase “knowing that.” This phrase seems to introduce traditional material throughout *Phil* (my test of “formulaic introduction”). I would concur with Barrett that “it is hard not to see an allusion to the Pastorals (1 Tim. 6:10, 7) in Polycarp 4.1.”<sup>57</sup>

Grant concludes that Polycarp knows both 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy.<sup>58</sup> He contends that the phrase “word of truth” (*Phil* 3.2) comes from 2 Timothy 2:15–16. I consider the literary dependency of such a common phrase to be impossible to prove. Both *Phil* 5.2 and 2 Timothy 2:12 promise that “we shall also reign with him (συμβασιλεύσομεν),” but this resemblance consists of a single word. Some have seen similarities between *Phil* 11.4 and 2 Timothy 2:25,<sup>59</sup> but the dependence is by no means certain. The reference to “loving the present world” (*Phil* 9.2; cf. 2 Timothy 4:10) seems a little stronger, due to its unusual nature. In sum, Polycarp probably knew 2 Timothy (an assumption partly based on “recurrence”), but the evidence is not as decisive as 1 Timothy.

---

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Seneca, *Epistle* 102.25: “non licet plus efferre quam intuleris” (*LCL*).

<sup>56</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 16.

<sup>57</sup> C. K. Barrett, “Pauline Controversies in the Post-Pauline Period,” *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974), 238; cf. Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 17; Schoedel finds the evidence “ambiguous,” but must concede that there seems to be a “greater likelihood” that Polycarp employs “material not of his own making” (Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 16). If this is the case, then *Phil* 4.3 *may* be an allusion to 1 Timothy 5:5.

<sup>58</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 103.

<sup>59</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 343.

## Synoptic Gospel and Acts Material

Scholars have vigorously debated Synoptic Gospel influence upon Polycarp. The Oxford Committee only accepted synoptic tradition in *Phil.*<sup>60</sup> They referred to a body of teaching containing oral tradition similar to the Sermon on the Mount or the early liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer.<sup>61</sup> Polycarp introduces his Jesus material with phrases such as the "teaching of the Lord" (2.3); the "λόγια of the Lord" (7.1), and "the λόγιον which was delivered to us in the beginning" (7.2). "The only exception to this is where he welds a part of the Lord's prayer into one of his sentences."<sup>62</sup> Clement introduces his sayings as λόγια τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. But as Dehandschutter notes, "the introduction of the Lord 'saying' gives little support to the supposition of a collection of λόγια."<sup>63</sup> Later authors, such as Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, though they use the written Gospel (already labeled "according to Matthew," etc.) still introduce passages as the Lord "speaking" (Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* IV.30.3; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* IV.45.4).

One must examine the four key passages in *Phil*: 2.3; 6.2; 7.2; and 12.3.<sup>64</sup> Chapter 2.3 states,

But remembering what the Lord taught when he said, "Judge not that ye be not judged, forgive and it shall be forgiven unto you, be merciful that ye may obtain mercy, with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again," and "Blessed are the poor, and they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of God."

There are four cola in the first section. The first, "Judge not that you be not judged" (Μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε) is a word-for-word parallel to Matthew 7:1. It differs from *1 Clement* 13: "As you judge, you shall be judged (ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως κριθήσεσθε)." The fourth phrase, "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" is similar to Matthew 7:2 except for two slight modifications:

---

<sup>60</sup> Goodspeed did the same (Goodspeed, *Formation*, 33, 37).

<sup>61</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 101–103.

<sup>62</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 245.

<sup>63</sup> Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle," 289–290.

<sup>64</sup> For the sake of space, I will disregard clearly weak examples, such as Bovon-Thurneysen's ascertaining of an expression of Matthew 25:21 in *Phil* 1.3 (Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik," 253).

Matt. 7:2: ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεται

*Phil* 2.3: ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν

*1 Clem.* 13: ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν

It is evident that *Phil* deletes the unnecessary ἐν with the dative of instrument (as does *1 Clement* 13), and modifies the verb “be measured” with the prefix ἀντι. Unlike *1 Clement* 13, but parallel to Matthew, Polycarp omits ἐν αὐτῷ.

The second and third cola resemble *1 Clement* 13:

*1 Clem* 13: Ἐλεᾶτε, ἵνα ἐλεηθῇτε. ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν

*Phil* 2.3: ἀφίετε, καὶ ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν. ἐλεᾶτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῇτε.

It is apparent that Polycarp switches the order of the two phrases, and changes a result ἵνα to a simple καὶ (which can also function to introduce a result clause) and alters “forgiven” from an aorist passive subjunctive to a future passive indicative. These last changes remind one of Luke 6:36–38 (using a different verb for “forgive”): ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε. Here we have the καὶ, but the second verb becomes second person plural future passive indicative rather than third person singular. The entire evidence causes Koester to argue that Polycarp corrects the saying in *1 Clement* 13 with the texts of Matthew and Luke.<sup>65</sup>

The second section of *Phil* 2.3 resembles Matthew 5:3 and 10. This section can be divided into two parts. The first parallels Matthew 5:3a:

Matt. 5:3: Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι

*Phil* 2.3: μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί

*Phil* does not continue the macarism with “in spirit.” Some have therefore supposed Lukan influence on *Phil*. But, as Dehandschutter points out, the Matthean “in spirit” is often omitted (cf. *Gospel of Thomas* log. 54).<sup>66</sup> Schoedel believes that “the variations which approach the Lukan tradition may show the

---

<sup>65</sup> Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 306; Cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 286–287: “Whether he made these corrections consciously or unconsciously, the significant fact remains that he did make them.” Köhler argued that *Phil* 2.3 is not directly dependent upon *1 Clement* 13, but rather upon “katechetisch durchgeformtes Material” (W.-D. Köhler, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 97–110). This possibility opens up another option besides Koester’s alternatives of oral tradition vs. written gospels.

<sup>66</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 288. See the redactional discussion later in this chapter.

influence also of that Gospel or may be the marks of quoting from memory.”<sup>67</sup> Perhaps Polycarp redacted his source in a manner that resembles the theme of economic poverty in Luke. Luke stresses Jesus’ concern for the materially poor and marginalized; if Valens had stolen the Philippian assembly’s common fund, they would have been left in a state of material need as well. Polycarp may have redacted Matthew in order to allude to the Philippians’ material poverty (see the full discussion later in this chapter).

The final part of *Phil* 2.3 resembles Matthew 5:10:

Matt. 5:10: μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

*Phil* 2.3: καὶ <μακάριοι> οἱ διωκόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Here, however, *Phil* differs from the characteristic Matthean “kingdom of heaven” (cf. Luke 6:20).

The last phrase of *Phil* 6.1 affirms, “knowing that we all owe the debt of sin.” We have already mentioned that “knowing that . . .” is a common Polycarpian way of introducing traditional material (“formulaic introduction”). But this phrase is not found in any extant early Christian work. The Oxford Committee determined that there was “nothing to indicate the source from which the quotation (if such it be) is derived.”<sup>68</sup> Lightfoot proposed the possibility of an apostolic or sub-apostolic work no longer extant.<sup>69</sup> Grant hypothesized that the introduction “knowing that” actually refers to the material in 6.2.<sup>70</sup> He points to a supposedly similarly delayed quotation in 4.3. Crockett, followed by Schoedel, maintains that the phrase comes from Matthew 6:12 with echoes of Luke 11:4: (“And forgive us our debts, As we also have forgiven our debtors” and “And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive every debtor of ours”).<sup>71</sup> From this synoptic material, Polycarp has “deduced” that we are all “debtors of sin,” or

---

<sup>67</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 12; cf. H. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 4–6, 112, 115–118.

<sup>68</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 104.

<sup>69</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 324.

<sup>70</sup> In Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 22.

<sup>71</sup> In *ibid.*, 22. Grant refers to “apparent allusions” to Matthew 6:12 and Luke 11:4 or Matthew 13:14–15 (Grant, *Formation*, 105).

“in need of forgiveness.”<sup>72</sup> The immediately subsequent sentence in *Phil* 6.2 (“If then we pray the Lord to forgive us, we also ought to forgive”) supports the “Lord’s Prayer” as the source; perhaps Polycarp was borrowing from catechetical material based upon the “Lord’s Prayer.” In sum, although *Phil* 6.1 begins with a “formulaic introduction,” it is too problematic to be employed as evidence for Polycarp’s use of the Synoptic Gospels.

*Phil* 6.2 states, “If then we pray the Lord to forgive us, we also ought to forgive . . . .” The thought of this passage is similar to the synoptic tradition of the “Lord’s Prayer.” But it verbally parallels neither Matthew, Luke, nor the *Didache*. It may be another loose allusion. Grant surmises that the “exact quotation” of Matthew 13:14–15 in *Phil* 6.2 “suggests” that Polycarp’s source was written.<sup>73</sup> But this is a curiously inaccurate statement.

*Phil* 7.2 contains more exact parallels: “. . . beseeching the all-seeing God in our supplications ‘to lead us not into temptation,’ even as the Lord said, ‘The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.’” The first allusion resembles Matthew 6:13:

Matt. 6:13: καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν

*Phil* 7.2: μὴ εἰσενεγκεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν

Of course, to match his participle “beseeching,” Polycarp changes “lead” into a complementary infinitive.

The second allusion parallels Matthew 26:41 (cf. Mark 14:38):

Matt. 26:41: τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής

*Phil* 7.2: Τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής

The Oxford Committee did not deny the exact verbal agreement here, but appealed to oral tradition, or “a document akin to our Gospels.”<sup>74</sup> It seems somewhat odd to postulate “a document akin to our Gospels” when a Matthean solution would seem simpler. In any case, as Dehandschutter argues, the combined weight of verbal equivalence in *Phil* 6.2 and 7.2 makes Matthean influence plausible and frankly probable.<sup>75</sup> My test of “recurrence” plays a role here. Similarly, Koester concludes that *Phil* 7.2 reveals a knowledge of Matthew

<sup>72</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 22.

<sup>73</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 104.

<sup>74</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 103.

<sup>75</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 288.

and Luke.<sup>76</sup> Since *Phil* connects the “Lord’s Prayer” with the prayer in Gethsemane, and since this correlation is already anticipated in the written Gospels (Matthew 6:38; 26:41), Koester supposes that Polycarp borrowed from the Gospels.<sup>77</sup>

*Phil* 12.3 states,

“Pray for all the saints. Pray also for the Emperors,” and for potentates, and princes, and for “those who persecute you and hate you,” and for “the enemies of the Cross” that “your fruit may be manifest among all men, that you may be perfected” in him.

The middle portion of this paragraph seems to be an allusion to Matthew 5:44: “But I say unto you, ‘Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you.’” The section summons such attitudes in order that the Philippians “may be perfected in him.” Koester notes that the themes of praying for persecutors and perfection were already connected in Matthew 5:44 and 5:48, and therefore Polycarp must have borrowed from the Matthean sequence (test of “density”).<sup>78</sup>

Koester maintains that Polycarp is the only Apostolic Father who demonstrates a clear dependence on written gospels rather than oral tradition.<sup>79</sup> Koester relies on Harrison’s two-letter thesis to explain this phenomenon. But a growing number of scholars are arguing that *2 Clement* and/or Ignatius also use Matthew.<sup>80</sup> The *Didache* may also employ Matthew, but this work is difficult to date with

---

<sup>76</sup> Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 306.

<sup>77</sup> Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 114–115.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 119–120.

<sup>79</sup> Grant agrees with Koester that *1 Clement* does not use Matthew (Grant, *Formation*, 78–80).

<sup>80</sup> Grant and Goodspeed argue that Ignatius is the first (Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 17); cf. Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 137; Goodspeed, *Formation*, 37; Grant, *Formation*, 102. Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 240. Köhler, Paulsen, and Luz agree that Ignatius uses Matthew (Köhler, *Die Rezeption*, 72–96; H. Paulsen, *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 37–39; U. Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Zürich: Benzinger, 1985), 75–76). Schoedel recognizes the possibility but sides with Koester that Ignatius only employs oral material (Schoedel, *Ignatius*, 9). Massaux strongly argued for use of Matthew by Ignatius (Massaux, *Influence*, 94–135). Trevett has contended for more openness to the option that Ignatius uses pre-Matthean tradition (C. Trevett, “Approaching Matthew from the Second Century: The Under-Used Ignatian Correspondence,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20 (1984): 59–67).

certainty.<sup>81</sup> The *Epistle of Barnabas* may also quote Matthew.<sup>82</sup> Papias' reference to the Gospels is well-known.<sup>83</sup>

In regard to Polycarp's knowledge of Acts, certain weak similarities are completely inconclusive (*Phil* 2.3 and Acts 20:35; *Phil* 6.3 and Acts 7:52; *Phil* 12.2 and Acts 26:18.) An exact verbal similarity is found between *Phil* 2.1 and Acts 10:42 (κριτῆς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν), but such a phrase seems to have been rather common kerygmatic fare. (Compare the similar phrases in 2 Timothy 4:1; 1 Peter 4:5; 2 *Clement* 1:1). The best evidence may come from *Phil* 1.2 and Acts 2:24.<sup>84</sup> The phrase "having loosed the pains (λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας)" (of death or Hades) occurs in both Acts and *Phil*, but it is a peculiar adaptive allusion to Psalm 18:4–6 (cf. 2 Samuel 22:6; Psalm 116:3) and is not found in the Septuagint. It seems unlikely that both Acts and Polycarp would have made the same allusive translation independently.<sup>85</sup> In the final analysis, it appears that Polycarp probably uses Matthew, and perhaps Luke and Acts as well.<sup>86</sup> The question of the use of Mark is less clear.<sup>87</sup> In any case, *Phil* seems to mitigate against those views which

---

<sup>81</sup> Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 13; cf. Goodspeed, *Formation*, 37; Grant, *Formation*, 67–68.

<sup>82</sup> Blackman, *Marcion*, 28; Goodspeed, *Formation*, 37.

<sup>83</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 71.

<sup>84</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 98; Schoedel, "Polycarp, Epistle of."

<sup>85</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 98; though the committee is open to the possibility that both Polycarp and Acts used a third source. Cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 290. Zahn buttresses the argument for dependence by claiming that Polycarp consciously transfers in his allusions from a Petrine sermon (Acts 2) to 1 Peter 1:8 (T. Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 3rd ed. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1909), 186 n.1).

<sup>86</sup> The only hindrance keeping me from speaking of Polycarp's "certain" use of Matthew is the possible use of catechetical and oral Matthew-like material (test of "singularity"). The weight of the entire evidence of *Phil* ("recurrence") would mitigate against such a source.

<sup>87</sup> Harrison compares "servant of all" in *Phil* 5.2 (which he mistakenly references as *Phil* 4.1) with Mark 9:35; but in the former, the expression is used of Jesus; in the latter, it is used of the disciples. *Phil* 5.3 ("it is good to be cut off from the lust of the things in the world") reminds Harrison of Mark 9:43 ("if your hand causes you to sin, cut it off: it is better for you . . ."), but this is a faint echo. Nevertheless, the combination of these two echoes from Mark 9 in close proximity in *Phil* 5 is stronger than the cases considered individually. The use of Mark 14:38 in *Phil* 7.2 is unnecessary, since the employment of Matthew 26:41 seems more probable (see above). In sum, I do not consider the evidence for Polycarp's incorporation of Mark to be especially convincing.



would place the first evidence of the use of the written Gospels with Justin Martyr.<sup>88</sup>

Campenhausen writes of the early second century: "Written and oral traditions run side by side or cross, enrich or distort one another, without distinction or even the possibility of distinction between them."<sup>89</sup> He continues, the Gospels "may be accepted or ignored, anthologized in any way that seems appropriate, expanded, or improved."<sup>90</sup> Campenhausen buttresses this perspective with the statements of Papias in which he seems to prefer oral tradition to written texts.<sup>91</sup> Campenhausen contrasts this use with the mid-second century situation, when Justin could introduce a dominical saying with "It is written"<sup>92</sup> and could refer to the reading of the apostolic memoirs in liturgy. Campenhausen may overstate the contrast, and he may misinterpret the evidence of Papias,<sup>93</sup> but *Phil* does demonstrate that early Christians loosely used Gospel material.

### Johannine and General Epistle Material

Polycarp does not appear to use the Gospel of John.<sup>94</sup> The Oxford Committee noted that *Phil* 5.2 refers to the Lord's promise to raise believers from the dead, and this promise only occurs in John, not the Synoptics.<sup>95</sup> However, the belief in

---

<sup>88</sup> I.e., H. Y. Gamble, *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 26–28. On the other hand, Grant argues that *1 Clement* uses Luke-Acts (Grant, *Formation*, 82).

<sup>89</sup> Campenhausen, *Formation*, 121.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, 136.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 130.

<sup>92</sup> Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 49, 100, 105.

<sup>93</sup> See R. P. C. Hanson, *Tradition in the Early Church* (London: SCM, 1962), 38f. Walls argues that Papias' statement was directed against heretical literature (A. F. Walls, "Papias and Oral Tradition," *Vigiliae Christianae* 21 (1967): 137–140). Hill maintains that Papias' contrast is between oral and written aids to interpretation, not oral tradition and written Gospels (C. E. Hill, "What Papias said about John (and Luke): A 'New' Papian Fragment," *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1998): 622–624).

<sup>94</sup> J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1943), 86.

<sup>95</sup> Oxford Society, *New Testament*, 103–104. Cf. E. Jacquier, *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'église chrétienne*. 2nd ed. Vol. 1 (Paris: Gabalda, 1911), 55.

Christ's raising his own in the last day was common kerygmatic material. Although Braun denies literary dependency, he does accept some influence of Johannine thought or theology on *Phil.*<sup>96</sup> Because of Polycarp's disregard of the Gospel of John, he does not display evidence of possessing a four-fold Gospel,<sup>97</sup> nor a Johannine collection.<sup>98</sup>

It does appear strange that Polycarp does not use the Gospel of John, since Irenaeus and Eusebius seem to affirm that Polycarp was John's disciple.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> F.-M. Braun, *Jean le théologien et son Évangile dans l'église ancienne* (Paris: Gabalda, 1959), 282–287.

<sup>97</sup> Nielsen, "Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures," 210; contra J. Orr, *Progress of Dogma*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908), 65; Marshall, "Use," 45. Goodspeed maintains that a four-fold Gospel was available in Ephesus by A.D. 125 (Goodspeed, *Formation*, 37–38). Eusebius preserves Papias' statements about Matthew and Mark (*Historia ecclesiastica* III.39.16), and many have assumed that Papias also commented on Luke and John, though this is unconfirmable. On the other hand, Knox' contention that Irenaeus provides the first adequate evidence of the fourfold Gospel is weak (Knox, *Marcion*, 149–152). Irenaeus does provide the first evidence of asserting the exclusive authority of the four-fold collection (Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 30–31). Burton alleges that Justin used all four gospels, but the evidence is not clear (Burton, Introduction, 37). Tatian's employment is the earliest certain confirmation of the use of all four Gospels. *Papyrus Egerton 2* may gather from all four canonical Gospels, though this is disputed. Basilides composed a Gospel harmony, but we no longer know what works he harmonized. The Valentinian *Gospel of Truth* incorporates both synoptic and Johannine material, but its dating is disputed (see Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 134–135). The mid-second century *Epistle of the Apostles* reflects all four Gospels (Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 22). Later Valentinians used all four Gospels, but this tradition cannot be traced back to Valentinus (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 140–141). Harnack assumes that a four-gospel collection existed before Marcion, and that Marcion criticized this collection (Harnack, *Marcion*, 79 n.1). Knox opposes this idea (Knox, *Marcion*, 140–157). Campenhausen insists that all "speculations" about a four-gospel canon before Marcion "are without foundation, and rest simply on the arbitrary retrojection on to this period of an anachronistic idea" (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 142). This contention may partly rest upon his insertion of "canon," as opposed to the more neutral term "collection" (see later discussion). For Campenhausen, Marcion is opposing the oral tradition of the Church, not canonical gospels (*ibid.*, 156; cf. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I.27.2, III.2.2, III.13.1f). But if one accepts Hill's reconstruction, Papias referred to all four Gospels (Hill, "What Papias Said," 582–629).

<sup>98</sup> Contra J. Mackinnon, *From Christ to Constantine* (London: Longmans, Green, 1936), 376ff.

<sup>99</sup> See D. R. Stuckwisch, "Saint Polycarp of Smyrna: Johannine or Pauline Figure?" *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 61 (1997): 113–125. This is compounded by the fact that Ignatius is clearly indebted to Johannine theology, though his use of Johannine literature is not as clear (Braun, *Jean*,

Furthermore, “The Gospel of John was the Gospel of Asia Minor,” as the Quartodeciman controversy reveals.<sup>100</sup> Polycarp’s own defense of the fourteenth of Nisan proves that Johannine tradition influenced him greatly. Although Polycarp may not, in fact, have possessed the Gospel of John, the issue is complicated by the Gospel’s mixed reception outside of Asia Minor and the recipients and purpose of *Phil.* The problematic nature of Polycarp’s relationship to “John” (discussed in my chapter 2) and perspectives on the authorship and hypothesized redactional history of the Gospel of John have also affected scholarship on this question.<sup>101</sup>

A similar problem arises with the peculiar absence of Revelation, since it includes a letter written to the Church of Smyrna (Revelation 2:8–11).<sup>102</sup> Some have suggested that Polycarp disagreed with the chiliasm of the Apocalypse; but this conjecture is not only unprovable, but also improbable.<sup>103</sup> Perhaps the reason lies in the context of Polycarp’s writing to the Philippians. Although the Gospel of John and Revelation carried great authority in Asia Minor, they were not readily accepted elsewhere.<sup>104</sup>

---

282–287; Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 256–262). Maurer and Loewenich have argued that Ignatius does use the Gospel of John (C. Maurer, *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1949); W. Loewenich, *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert* (Gießen: Töpelmann, 1932), 25–38). Grant sides with Maurer on this issue (Grant, *Formation*, 98–102). For the opposite opinion, see von der Goltz, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 131–144. Von der Goltz’ theory that Ignatius had earlier visited the evangelical author in Ephesus seems unnecessary (*ibid.*, 174).

<sup>100</sup> Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 59.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Meinhold’s comments (Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1688).

<sup>102</sup> Harrison maintains that although Polycarp did not have Revelation, he had the epistle in Revelation 2:8–11. This view assumes that the seven epistles in Revelation were originally separate. Aune concludes that “The seven proclamations did not exist independently of Revelation, but were developed specifically for the present setting by the author” (Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, 119). Polycarp does not allude to Revelation 2:8–11 in *Phil.*

<sup>103</sup> Compare Papias’ chiliasm, and the general chiliastic tendencies in Asia Minor in the second century. Campenhausen conjectures that Papias may have even known the Apocalypse (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 130).

<sup>104</sup> See T. E. Pollard, “John the Evangelist, Gospel of,” in *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, ed. A. Di Berardino, trans. A. Walford (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972).

It is to be concluded, therefore, that Polycarp may have made no reference to these books deliberately. Perhaps it was the diplomatic thing to do. Both books were in different ways troublesome and caused no little conflict in various parts of the Church.<sup>105</sup>

Campanhausen has denied Polycarpian use of the Johannine epistles. He dismisses the seemingly clear quotation in *Phil* 7.1 as a “typische kirchliche Parole im Kampf gegen die kleinasiatische Gnosis.”<sup>106</sup> Johnson concurs with the lack of dependence.<sup>107</sup> But the evidence for direct influence from 1 John is fairly strong.<sup>108</sup> Although the Oxford Committee gave it a “lower degree of probability,” Loewenich considers it undeniable.<sup>109</sup> The Johannine epistles are the only New Testament writings to use the term “antichrist” (1 John 2:18; 2:22; 4:3; 2 John 7), and Polycarp is the only Apostolic Father to use it as well. *Phil* 7.1 closely resembles 1 John 4:2–3 and 2 John 7, and also seems to borrow the phrase ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὶν from 1 John 3:8. Furthermore, *Phil* 7.2 continues with a reference to “the word delivered to us from the beginning,” perhaps an allusion to 1 John 1:1.<sup>110</sup> Thus, the tests of “density” and “singularity” point toward Polycarp’s knowledge of 1 John. If one agrees that Polycarp incorporates 1 John 4:2–3, then the use of 2 John 7 is possible but not necessary.<sup>111</sup>

No one doubts that Polycarp clearly uses 1 Peter. Eusebius had already commented on this fact (*Historia ecclesiastica* IV.14.8). The echoes of 1 Peter in *Phil* include the following: *Phil* 1.3=1 Peter 1:8; *Phil* 2.1=1 Peter 1:13, 21; *Phil* 2.2=1 Peter 3:9; *Phil* 5.3=1 Peter 2:11; (*Phil* 7.2=1 Peter 4:7); *Phil* 8.1=1 Peter 2:24, 22; (*Phil* 10.1=1 Peter 2:17, 5:5); *Phil* 10.2=1 Peter 2.12.

---

<sup>105</sup> Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 70–71.

<sup>106</sup> Campanhausen, *Polykarp von Smyrna*, 40–41.

<sup>107</sup> Johnson, “Parallels,” 329–333.

<sup>108</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 284.

<sup>109</sup> Loewenich, *Johannes-Verständnis*, 23.

<sup>110</sup> Use of 1 John by Polycarp fits the chronology of Eusebius’ assertion that Papias knew and used both 1 Peter and 1 John (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* III.39.17). Besides the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles, only Acts, 1 Peter, and 1 John gained ready acceptance in the early Church (Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 50).

<sup>111</sup> See Grant, *Formation*, 104–105; Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 292; Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 173.

Grant and Goodspeed argue that Polycarp knows the book of Hebrews,<sup>112</sup> but I personally find the supposed evidence unconvincing (see *Phil* 6.3 and Hebrews 12:28; *Phil* 12.2 and Hebrews 6:20,<sup>113</sup> 7:3; *Phil* 9.1 and Hebrews 5:13). On the other hand, knowledge of Hebrews is clearly attested even earlier by *1 Clement*.<sup>114</sup>

Bihlmeyer adds James<sup>115</sup> to the list of Polycarp's sources and cites a possible reference to 2 Peter.<sup>116</sup> Marshall finds a reminiscence of 2 Peter 3:15 in *Phil* 3.2.<sup>117</sup> All these allusions to James and 2 Peter seem imaginary to me. Harrison concludes that the case for James and Jude is stronger than that of 2 and 3 John,<sup>118</sup> but I conclude that this claim likewise is doubtful. My tests are unable to buttress an argument for the incorporation of these documents.

### Polycarp's Use of Sources

Polycarp's dependence on sources should not be limited to verbal quotations alone. For example, certain elements of *Phil* are Pauline but cannot be traced to any specific quotation.<sup>119</sup> Lindemann notes Polycarp's movement from indicative to imperative (1.3–2.1),<sup>120</sup> his use of the triad of πίστις, ἐλπίς, and ἀγάπη (3.2–3), his *Haustafeln* (4.2–6.2), and the use of personified ἀμαρτία in the singular (6.1).<sup>121</sup> Harrison adds characteristic Pauline expressions which occur in more than one canonical epistle (such as παρακαλῶ οὖν . . . ὑμᾶς in *Phil* 9.1 and ἀξίως . . . περιπατεῖν in *Phil* 5.1).<sup>122</sup>

Dehandschutter has rightfully lamented that Polycarp's use of New Testament literature has been limited to canon questions, narrowing the investigation to

<sup>112</sup> Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 17. Grant states that this is "almost certainly" the case (Grant, *Formation*, 104).

<sup>113</sup> See Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 198, 220 n.3.

<sup>114</sup> Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 9.

<sup>115</sup> Bihlmeyer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 119. See also Derrett, "Scripture," 676. Cf. the use of χαλιναγωγέω in *Phil* 5.3 and James 1:26, 3:2.

<sup>116</sup> Bihlmeyer, *Die Apostolischen Väter*, 115.

<sup>117</sup> Marshall, "Use," 43.

<sup>118</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 301.

<sup>119</sup> Lindemann, "Paul," 43.

<sup>120</sup> Although Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik," 250 would minimize this movement in *Phil*.

<sup>121</sup> Lindemann, "Paul," 43.

<sup>122</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 294.

“what” texts he uses rather than including “how” he uses them.<sup>123</sup> I have already noted how Polycarp introduces quotations with “knowing that . . .” (1.3; 4.1; 4.3; 5.1; 6.1). Another common introduction to his material is simply “for” (1 Peter 2:11 and 1 Corinthians 6:9–10 in *Phil* 5.3; Romans 14:10–12 in *Phil* 6.2). Once he uses “being persuaded that” (Philippians 2:16 in *Phil* 9.2); another time he begins “do we not know” (1 Corinthians 6:2 in *Phil* 11.2).<sup>124</sup>

But most of the time, Polycarp simply strings together loose allusions to traditional material. The evidence seems to point to Polycarp’s *memoriter* citation.<sup>125</sup> Often texts are merged due to their common use of a word or idea, pointing to a pattern in Polycarp’s recollections. For example, *Phil* 2.1–2 (πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόντα αὐτῷ δόξαν. . . ὁ δὲ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ) strings together allusions to 1 Peter 1:21, Romans 8:11, 1 Corinthians 6:14, and perhaps 2 Corinthians 4:14, apparently because of the common verb ἐγείρω.<sup>126</sup> *Phil* 2.2–3 continues with a catena of passages concerning the forgiveness of enemies (1 Peter 3:9; Matthew 7:1–2; Luke 6:36–38; 1 *Clement* 13; Matthew 5:3, 10).<sup>127</sup>

Another good example of culling various materials comes in *Phil* 10. There Polycarp alludes to Tobit 4:10, 12:9, and 1 Peter 2:12: “For almsgiving sets free from death, be ye all subject one to the other, having your conversation blameless among the Gentiles, that you may receive praise for your good works.” This idea of blameless conduct before the Gentiles leads to the thought of not being a cause of blaspheming among them. Here, Polycarp turns to Isaiah 52:5 (or perhaps Isaiah 52:5 as quoted in Ignatius, *Trallians* 8.2): “But woe to him through whom

---

<sup>123</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 275. Cf. Hays’ question in regard to Paul: “What is Paul actually *doing* with Scripture when he appeals to it in his arguments?” (Hays, “On the Rebound,” 94). Similarly, Rathke stresses Ignatius’ relationship to Pauline thought beyond mere quotation. See H. Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriege* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967).

<sup>124</sup> See Grant, *Formation*, 105.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. Hagner’s similar work on 1 *Clement* (D. A. Hagner, *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 287–312).

<sup>126</sup> The flow of thought of the whole section (*Phil* 2.1–3) seems to be connected by the theme of future judgment as a motivation for present living.

<sup>127</sup> See also Harrison’s perspective on the stringing of allusions in *Phil* 9.2 (Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 294).

the name of the Lord is blasphemed.” The context in Isaiah 52 speaks of God’s people Israel as a cause of blasphemy among their Gentile neighbors. Once again, Polycarp’s memory seems to string allusions together due to a common theme.

The twin themes of prayer and enemies weave *Phil* 12.3 together. Polycarp jumps from praying for all the saints and for emperors (1 Tim. 2:1–2) to praying for those who persecute (Matt. 5:44 par.), who are the enemies of the cross (*Phil.* 3:18), in order that one’s fruit might be manifest.

Intertextuality<sup>128</sup> helps us establish a link between the “righteous response of forgiveness” and the “righteous response of endurance” found in *Phil.* For instance, chapter 8 affirms,

Let us then persevere unceasingly in our hope, and in the pledge of our righteousness, that is in Christ Jesus, “who bare our sins in his own body on the tree, who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth,” but for our sakes, that we might live in him, he endured all things. Let us then be imitators of his endurance, and if we suffer for his name’s sake let us glorify him. For this is the example which he gave us in himself, and this is what we have believed.

Here we notice that the theme word of “righteousness” is tied to a context of perseverance and endurance (mentioned three times). Polycarp makes his point by alluding to 1 Peter 2:24 and 2:22. But the “echo” of 1 Peter would extend beyond the quoted portions. 1 Peter 2:23 states, “When they hurled their insults at him, he did not retaliate; when he suffered, he made no threats. Instead, he entrusted himself to him who judges justly.” 1 Peter clearly refers to a *forgiving* endurance, one that does not seek retribution but places the case before God. The intertextuality of these allusions to 1 Peter tie the righteous responses of forgiveness and endurance together.

---

<sup>128</sup> I am using “intertextuality” in the narrow sense of one text’s appearance in another, not in the broader social-critical sense. For an introduction to the debate, see G. Aichele and G. A. Phillips, “Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis,” *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 7–11; J. Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, trans. M. Waller (New York: Columbia University, 1984), 59–60. Cf. Green’s criticism of Hays (W. S. Green, “Doing the Text’s Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul’s Use of Scripture,” in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 59), and Hays’ response (Hays, “On the Rebound,” 80). Hays reasons: “If Green should insist on denying me permission to use the term ‘intertextuality’ (since my work does not properly reverence its ‘larger purpose’), I will surrender it with a shrug. Nothing is at stake for me in the use of the term” (*ibid.*, 81).

Polycarp employs a creative intertextual maneuver in *Phil* 11.2 as well. In 1 Corinthians 6:2, Paul had exhorted his readers not to take their church problems to the pagan courts, since they, as eschatological co-judges with Christ, should possess sufficient juridical abilities: "Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?" In *Phil* 11.2, Polycarp writes, "If any man does not abstain from avarice he will be defiled by idolatry, and shall be judged as if he were among the Gentiles who know not the judgment of God. Or do we not know that the saints shall judge the world?" Here, Polycarp beseeches them to refrain from avarice, since that covetousness would characterize them as among the pagans in the judgment rather than as among the righteous co-judges.<sup>129</sup> He uses the Pauline quotation, but his motivation transforms the application.

Another interesting intertextual phenomenon occurs in *Phil* 12.3. The expression "enemies of the cross" seemingly is borrowed from Philippians 3:18, where it is used of antinomian gluttons. But within the context of *Phil*, it appears to be used of either the heretical (Docetic?) enemies of the (real suffering on the) cross<sup>130</sup> or perhaps (within the specific context) political leaders persecuting the church. Either way, Polycarp has transformed the meaning of the original text.

*Phil* 2.3 may reveal a Polycarpian redactional maneuver. Some have argued that certain differences between the Matthean material in *Phil* and our present gospel point to Polycarp's utilization of oral material. But our reconstructed background may help explain one such divergence: Although *Phil* 2.3 contains a conflation of the exact vocabulary of Matthew 5:3 and 10, the abridging of Matthew's "poor in spirit" (resembling Luke's mere "poor") is puzzling. If we remember that Polycarp applies the Matthean material to the Philippians' exact situation of material poverty due to Valens' theft, the deletion is explicable. Polycarp may have redacted Matthew (perhaps using the Lukan version) to reflect the situation in Philippi: the congregation had been left materially poor.<sup>131</sup> Polycarp may also have brought together the beatitudes concerning the poor and

---

<sup>129</sup> Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik," 245.

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 346.

<sup>131</sup> Cf. Polycarp's alteration of the Matthean τῶν οὐράνων to the Lukan τοῦ θεοῦ (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 326). Dehandschutter thinks Lukan influence is unnecessary (Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle," 288).



the persecuted for righteousness' sake because both promise the Kingdom as a reward.<sup>132</sup>

A final example involves the expression "poring over" a text (from the verb ἐγκύπτω). *1 Clement* repeatedly refers to "poring over" the Scriptures, by which he means the Old Testament (*1 Clement* 45.2; 53.1; 62.3; cf. 40.1). These Clementine references occur in paraenetic "disavowals of need for further instruction": the Corinthians had pored over the Scriptures. As we have noted, Polycarp knew *1 Clement* "almost by heart." But Polycarp applies Clement's favorite term to the Pauline corpus: Paul, "when he was absent wrote letters to you, from the study of which (εἰς ἃς ἔαν ἐγκύπτῃτε) you will be able to build yourselves up into the faith given you" (*Phil* 3.2). Polycarp appears to place the Pauline letters on the level of authoritative writings, since they require treatment similar to that of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Because *Phil* is paraenetic, it is not surprising that it regularly incorporates paraenetic sources. Just as Ignatius heavily uses 1 Corinthians and Ephesians because they stress church unity,<sup>133</sup> Polycarp frequently uses paraenetic material, such as 1 Peter, the dominical sayings, Paul's moral exhortations, and *1 Clement*, because they fit his purpose.<sup>134</sup> It is instructive that all the Matthean material in *Phil* comes from the paraenetic Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7). This phenomenon stands as a warning: we cannot equate the sources Polycarp used with the sources he knew.<sup>135</sup> The argument from silence is not strong. Polycarp culled his authorities from paraenetic material. Certain books he possessed may not have fit this mold, and thus he may not have used them.<sup>136</sup> He may have set others aside in deference to his Philippian audience.

---

<sup>132</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 326.

<sup>133</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 97.

<sup>134</sup> Meinhold relates Polycarp's common use of Pauline material to a conflict with Marcion (Meinhold, "Polykarpos"); we have related the repetitive incorporation to Polycarp's audience of the Pauline-founded Philippian congregation.

<sup>135</sup> As Grant acknowledges, "... the presence of particular books in the particular writings we possess does not prove that other books were not in use. Our evidence is too severely limited for us to be able to erect lofty edifices of inference upon it" (Grant, *Formation*, 29). Cf. Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 233.

<sup>136</sup> On the other hand, it would appear likely that Polycarp did not possess James, since he does not allude to this strongly paraenetic work.

## Summary

In conclusion, Polycarp is an important witness to the acceptance and use of the New Testament documents. He quotes or alludes to far more books than any other writer of his period. In my estimation, he *certainly* employs Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 Timothy, and 1 Peter; he *probably* uses Matthew, 2 Corinthians, 2 Timothy, and 1 John; and he *possibly* uses a variety of other works, including Luke, Acts, and 2 Thessalonians. If we confine ourselves to the certain and probable instances, we are left with eleven New Testament compositions; adding the possible works brings the total number to fourteen.

If one accepts the unity and early dating of his epistle, then Polycarp's witness to the New Testament becomes even more valuable.<sup>137</sup> For example, he appears to be the first to clearly use Galatians, Philippians, 1 Timothy, and 1 Peter. He is also the first probable evidence of 2 Timothy and 1 John, and perhaps an important first witness to Acts as well.<sup>138</sup> Our first witness of an indebtedness to these works is then moved from A.D. 135 to A.D. 115. A two-decade span, though seemingly inconsequential, is a relatively large interval of time in this crucial period.

For example, theories which place the composition of the Pastorals as late as 130<sup>139</sup> must be discarded.<sup>140</sup> Based purely upon the external evidence of Polycarp,

---

<sup>137</sup> Harrison himself knew in regard to Polycarp's use of the New Testament literature that "the value and point of that information in nearly every instance depends mainly on the accuracy and certainty with which we are able to fix its date" (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 6). Harrison believes that *Phil* is the first attestation of 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John, the Pastorals, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and 2 Thessalonians (*ibid.*, 7). I have argued that the evidence for 2 Corinthians and 2 Timothy is "probable," the dependence on 2 Thessalonians is "possible," and the incorporation of Titus and 2 John is indemonstrable.

<sup>138</sup> Grant asserts that Ignatius incorporated 1 Peter (Grant, *Formation*, 96) as does Lightfoot. But the Oxford Committee disapproved of this position, and, as Harrison notes, with very good reason (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 240). Grant's proposals that 2 Peter and Ignatius may use 1 Timothy are not widely accepted (Grant, *Formation*, 25, 94–96). His reference to the *Epistle of Barnabas* may be inconsequential, due to chronological questions (*ibid.*, 107).

<sup>139</sup> Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 305–308. Couchoud placed them after A.D. 144 (P. L. Couchoud, "La Première Édition de Saint Paul," *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 18 (1926), 244).

<sup>140</sup> Later witnesses to the Pastorals include Tatian (in Jerome), Athenagoras, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and the Muratorian Canon (Kümmel, *Introduction*, 370). There may be an allusion to

Kümmel's placement at the "beginning of the second century" would be as late as one might go.<sup>141</sup> Accordingly, we must reject W. Bauer's opinion: "the further hypothesis seems to me valid that the pastoral Epistles still were not in existence at the time that Marcion made his decision as to the extent of the Pauline material."<sup>142</sup>

Johnson's suggestion that the Johannine epistles were written "not earlier than the time of Ignatius" must also be revised.<sup>143</sup> Similarly, R. E. Brown recognizes that Polycarp is a relatively clear witness to the use of 1 John, but he merely states that *Phil* "can scarcely be dated after 140" (seemingly allowing for Harrison's theory). Brown cites this as proof that 1 John's "ideas, themes, and even slogans" "were being cited in other Christian works" by "mid-second century."<sup>144</sup> However, we have argued that *Phil* should be dated to c. A.D. 115. 1 John was already being cited *early* in the second century. Similarly, the views of Quispel, who seems to place the Pastoral Epistles, 1 Peter, and 1 John all after Marcion but before the end of the second century, must be corrected as well.<sup>145</sup>

*Phil* also seems to serve as evidence against theories such as Knox's, which place the composition of Acts around A.D. 125 or even later.<sup>146</sup> Some of Knox's

---

the Pastorals in Ignatius, *Magnesians* 8.1, but it seems too uncertain (Lindemann, "Paul," 38–41); the connection between 1 Clement 60.4 and 1 Timothy 2:1–3 seems even more tedious (*ibid.*, 34–35). Harrison finds the Ignatian use of the Pastorals lacking when compared to Polycarp, but goes on to propose a complicated theory of the author of the Pastorals using Ignatius who in turn used loose Pauline notes (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 251–255).

<sup>141</sup> Kümmel, *Introduction*, 370. Polycarp's use of the Pastorals is not necessarily tied to the authorship of the Pastorals. For instance, Streeter maintained both that the Pastorals could not be written later than A.D. 110 and that they were the editorial work of a second century Paulinist (Streeter, *Primitive Church*, 102).

<sup>142</sup> W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy*, 223.

<sup>143</sup> Johnson, "Parallels," 332. Earlier, he had argued that the Johannine Epistles represented "the tradition of the Fourth Gospel with the thought of Ignatius superimposed upon it" (S. E. Johnson, "Asia Minor and Early Christianity," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 115f and n. 95). He later abandoned this position of direct dependence (Johnson, "Parallels," 327–328).

<sup>144</sup> R. E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1982), 9.

<sup>145</sup> G. Quispel, "Marcion and the Text of the New Testament," *Vigiliae Christianae* 52 (1998): 357.

<sup>146</sup> Knox portrayed the redaction of Luke-Acts as an anti-Marcionite production to be dated around A.D. 150 (Knox, *Marcion*, 120–123); He reiterates this view in his later, "Acts," 287 n.8. There he places the composition of Acts "as late as, say, A.D. 125" (*ibid.*, 286).

followers, admittedly in the minority of New Testament scholarship, continue to call for a mid-second century dating of Acts.<sup>147</sup> The possible incorporation of Acts in *Phil* may argue against such a hypothesis.

In conclusion, Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* establishes an external *terminus ante quem* for the compositions of 1 Peter, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, 1 John, and perhaps Acts: they must have been written in time for them to be distributed to (and attain a certain status in) Smyrna by A.D. 115.

---

<sup>147</sup> See J. T. Townsend, "The Date of Luke-Acts," in *Luke Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. C. Talbert (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 47–62. Townsend maintains that "no definite citation of Acts exists before the last quarter of the second century" (Townsend, "Contributions," 88), and he points to linguistic and ideological parallels between the Clementine Homilies and Acts. See also Tyson, "John Knox."

## Chapter 12

### Polycarp and Scripture

I have argued that scholars have consistently gleaned Polycarp's evidence concerning the New Testament without first attempting to reconstruct the background, occasion, purpose, and rhetoric of *Phil* as it can be understood in and of itself. Therefore, since we have endeavored to reconstruct this substructure, we can now turn to various issues related to Polycarp's use of Scripture (this chapter) and Pauline material specifically (the following chapter).<sup>1</sup>

### Polycarp's Style

First, our study helps vindicate Polycarp's writing style. He has often been accused of being dry, unoriginal, and unimaginative.<sup>2</sup> The main evidence for such derision has been his tendency merely to merge traditional material, his "veritable mosaic of quotations and allusions."<sup>3</sup> But the situation dictated the necessity of the weaving of authoritative *testimonia* into the epistle. It is unfortunate that we do not possess other Polycarpian writings which might exonerate his originality.<sup>4</sup>

Nevertheless, my close examination of Polycarp's argument reveals that he employed both imaginative rhetoric and creative structure in the use of quotations in his text.<sup>5</sup> And there is a method to his seemingly random referencing – his loose allusions from memory are often connected thematically. Furthermore, I have argued that one of Polycarp's purposes was to exhort the Philippians not to seek vengeance. Polycarp may have thought it wise to engage in such a confrontation behind the authority of texts rather than directly.

---

<sup>1</sup> These specific issues are listed in the introduction.

<sup>2</sup> See quotes in my chapter 4.

<sup>3</sup> Richardson, *Early Christian Fathers*, vol. 1, 123.

<sup>4</sup> "In either case, Polycarp did not set out to write an important theological work, whether he was capable of one or not" (Lindemann, "Paul," 43).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle."

Harnack acknowledges,

The language is simple but powerful, and, while there is undoubtedly a lack of original ideas, the author shows remarkable skill in weaving together pregnant sentences and impressive warnings selected from the apostolic epistles and the first Epistle of Clement.<sup>6</sup>

But even this mixed praise is not strong enough. The contrast between originality and transmitting tradition is a false dichotomy. One may weave together traditional sources in very creative ways.<sup>7</sup> My investigations of Polycarp's repeated theme, rhetorical strategies, and intertextual uses have revealed his ingenuity. The analysis of Polycarp's rhetorical response to the Valens scandal portrays a unifying purpose throughout the letter.<sup>8</sup>

### Polycarp and the Old Testament

Second, the background helps explain the profusion of New Testament citations and the near absence of Old Testament material. Polycarp incessantly quotes or alludes to New Testament texts, but rarely to Old Testament writings. Grant states that the Old Testament was "practically unknown" to Polycarp,<sup>9</sup> and Schoedel agrees that his use of the Old Testament is "slight."<sup>10</sup> Some have compared this to the many Old Testament allusions in such texts as *1 Clement* and accordingly have argued either that Polycarp's letter must be dated decades later<sup>11</sup> or that Polycarp had Marcionite tendencies.<sup>12</sup> This study does not support such theories. Just because Polycarp uses certain texts but not others does not mean that he was unaware of those texts or that he was aware of them but did not consider them authoritative. First, we must remember that Polycarp was probably

---

<sup>6</sup> As quoted in Andrews, "Polycarp."

<sup>7</sup> "Wenn auch dem Verfasser häufig die nötige, verbindende Gestaltungskraft abgeht, so wird doch in Art und Weise, wie er das Traditionsgut auswählt und verwendet, sein theologischer Standort sichtbar" (Bovon-Thurneysen, "Ethik," 242). The main thrust of the Bovon-Thurneysen article is that Polycarp alters the New Testament relationship between eschatology and ethics (the connection between the indicative and the imperative).

<sup>8</sup> Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 75.

<sup>9</sup> Grant, "Polycarp of Smyrna," 145.

<sup>10</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 5.

<sup>11</sup> Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 285.

<sup>12</sup> Nielsen, "Polycarp and Marcion."

a Christian from his youth and would have been well-versed in the Christian Scriptures.<sup>13</sup> The fourth century *Life of Polycarp* recognized this probability (*Life* 19). Second, Polycarp lived in Smyrna, and may have reacted to the Christian-Jewish problems there.<sup>14</sup> Third, he took account of the fact that he was writing to the Philippian church, and therefore stressed the letters of Paul (*Phil* 3). Fourth, it would be consistent for Polycarp to weave together references from early Christian material to address the very Christian (church-centered) problem of Valens' fall, and Polycarp wanted to assure his readers that his advice was compatible with Christian tradition. The use of Christian citations and allusions serves "den Einklang mit der Überlieferung deutlich hörbar zu machen."<sup>15</sup> Fifth, Polycarp does allude to Old Testament texts on rare occasions, as I demonstrated in my chapter 11. Sixth, "A further point, not noted by Harrison, is the presence of Jewish or Jewish-Christian catechetical material, not found in the New Testament, in Chs. i–xii of Polycarp's Epistle."<sup>16</sup> Grant finds similar Jewish catechetical material in *1 Clement*,<sup>17</sup> and Selwyn has demonstrated that such material was interwoven into 1 Peter, as well as various other early Christian paraenetic texts.<sup>18</sup> Even beyond strictly catechetical material, Jewish thought has

---

<sup>13</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.1, 439. The *Martyrdom* 9 portrays Polycarp as having served Jesus Christ for eighty-six years. Barnard contends, "Unlike Clement of Rome and the writer of Barnabas he was born of Christian parents and had been familiar with Christian teaching from childhood" (Barnard, "Problem," 35; cf. Lightfoot, *Essays*, 94; Salmon, "Polycarpus"). *Phil* also fits well with the differences in quotation that Grant ascertains between "Jewish Christianity," "Hellenistic-Jewish Christianity," and "Hellenistic Christianity" (Grant, *Formation*, 64, 130).

<sup>14</sup> Hemer comments on the relative lack of Hebrew Scripture material in the letter to Smyrna in Revelation: "The separation of the Christian and Jewish communities may help to account for the comparative lack of Jewish allusion in this letter" (Hemer, *Letters*, 76). Hemer finds more New Testament than Old Testament parallels in Revelation 2:8–11 (*ibid.*, 67–68).

<sup>15</sup> Steinmetz, "Polykarp von Smyrna," 75. Nielsen concludes that perhaps due to "reasons of his own" no longer available to us, Polycarp chose not to rely on the Hebrew Scriptures (Nielsen, "Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures," 213). But Grant points the way (in regard to Ignatius in this case): "The books he found most important were the ones in which he found statements relevant to his conception of himself and of fellow-Christians" (Grant, *Formation*, 89). Naturally, the works which fit such purposes would be Christian ones.

<sup>16</sup> Barnard, "Problem," 37; though Dehandschutter disagrees (Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle," 285).

<sup>17</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 78–79.

<sup>18</sup> E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1947), 363–466.

influenced *Phil.* For example, Bovon-Thurneysen recognizes that the phrase “whose blood God will require of those who disobey him” can only be explained in a Jewish context.<sup>19</sup> Seventh, several New Testament works do not allude to the Hebrew Scriptures either, or only very sparingly.<sup>20</sup> The Pastorals obviously do not look down upon the Old Testament, since they emphasize scriptural knowledge (2 Timothy 3:14–17), but they only contain one clear quotation (2 Timothy 5:18).<sup>21</sup> The only incorporation of the Hebrew Scriptures in the Johannine letters is a passing reference to Cain (1 John 3:12); the short epistles 2 and 3 John do not allude to the Old Testament at all.<sup>22</sup> Eighth, we recall that the ethnic constituency of Philippi (and therefore the Philippian church) was almost solely Gentile. Polycarp would be less prone to use the Hebrew Scriptures with such an audience, even as the Apostle Paul (who heavily borrowed from the Old Testament elsewhere), never cites and rarely echoes the Hebrew Scriptures in his epistle to the Philippians. Ninth, Ignatius, Polycarp’s contemporary, uses the Old Testament extremely sparingly as well.<sup>23</sup> Schoedel considers Ignatius to quote the Old Testament clearly only twice.<sup>24</sup> But “It would be perverse to read into such a profession a deliberate depreciation of the ancient Scriptures.”<sup>25</sup> Tenth, the unusual nature of the *Didache* has been overlooked in this context. The beginning of this work, which describes “the Way of Life,” is arranged in a purposeful

---

<sup>19</sup> The phrase is “eine alttestamentliche Vergeltungsformel” (Bovon-Thurneysen, “Ethik,” 243). Bovon-Thurneysen contends that the statement is probably a Polycarpian addition to the confessional sources behind *Phil* 2.1, since the phrase destroys the parallelism of the various confessional phrases by changing the subject to God. The guilt of the blood of Christ is mentioned in Luke 11:50; Acts 5:28; Matthew 27:25.

<sup>20</sup> In this regard, we must remember that only one work of Polycarp is extant. What would one make of Paul’s knowledge and use of the Hebrew Scriptures if only the canonical Philippians were available?

<sup>21</sup> For a discussion of 2 Timothy 2:19, see Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 112.

<sup>22</sup> Campenhausen, *Formation*, 62 n.2.

<sup>23</sup> Lindemann explains this phenomenon with the fact that they are the final words of a bishop on his way to martyrdom (Lindemann, “Paul,” 36).

<sup>24</sup> *Ephesians* 5.3; *Magnesians* 12; both of these quotations are introduced with “it is written.” Schoedel sees possible allusions in *Ephesians* 15.1; *Magnesians* 13.1; *Trallians* 8.2; *Romans* 7.2 (Schoedel, “Polycarp of Smyrna,” 305). Campenhausen finds “at most three” (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 62; cf. 72).

<sup>25</sup> Campenhausen, *Formation*, 72. H. Rathke may undervalue Ignatius’ reliance on the Hebrew Scriptures (Rathke, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 23–26).



manner. The first section (*Didache* 1) draws extensively from the dominical tradition (similar to the Sermon on the Mount), but never the Old Testament.<sup>26</sup> The second section (*Didache* 2) lists a series of negative commands taken from the Old Testament. Farkasfalvy writes,

In other words, we are dealing with a composition that sets moral guidelines from both specifically Christian and Jewish (Old Testament) sources and juxtaposes the two kinds of material without mixing them. The author definitely shows awareness that these two blocks of moral precepts are of a twofold origin.<sup>27</sup>

The *Didache* proves that it was possible for an early second century author to write at least portions of paraenesis purely from Christian tradition, if he so chose.<sup>28</sup> This context helps explain the abundance of New Testament material and the lack of Old Testament citations.

### Polycarp and Marcionite Tendencies

Third, our reconstruction relieves Polycarp of the accusation of having Marcionite tendencies. Nielsen and Kümmel have argued that Polycarp virtually disregarded the Old Testament because he actually sympathized with Marcion's limited canon.<sup>29</sup> It is true that Polycarp rarely uses Jewish Scripture material, as seen above. It is also true that he frequently borrows from Paul. Yet this can be easily explained by the fact that he was writing to the Philippians, who understandably held Paul in great esteem (*Phil* 3.2).<sup>30</sup> In addition, Polycarp's use of Pauline materials comes almost exclusively from the paraenetic sections, not the theological ones. Massaux notes, "il est à noter que tous les passages pauliniens

<sup>26</sup> Some have argued that *Didache* 1:3b–4a is an interpolation. If so, it is a relatively early addition. See R. A. Kraft, *Barnabas and the Didache* (New York: Nelson, 1964), 60–61.

<sup>27</sup> Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 128.

<sup>28</sup> Similarly, the difficult-to-date *Epistle to Diognetus* rarely alludes to the Old Testament, is unfavorable to Jews, is strongly Pauline, and yet is not Marcionite.

<sup>29</sup> Earlier, Nielsen had merely stated that "for all practical purposes the Old Testament was not really a living authority for him" (Nielsen, "Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures," 205), although Polycarp still retained the Old Testament in his authoritative canon (*ibid.*, 207). But Nielsen's rhetoric became even stronger in his 1986 article (Nielsen, "Polycarp and Marcion"). See also Kümmel, *Introduction*, 484.

<sup>30</sup> Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle," 281.

dont il dépend ont un caractère moral nettement marqué ou bien sont introduits dans des contextes moraux.”<sup>31</sup> Accordingly, Polycarp’s most frequently used source is actually 1 Peter, a thoroughly paraenetic letter; Dehandschutter comments, “On the whole 1 Peter is received with a particular stress on the ethical dimensions of his thought.”<sup>32</sup> Polycarp draws heavily from 1 Clement; and Polycarp’s use of Matthew is limited to the paraenetic Sermon on the Mount.<sup>33</sup> One might surmise that 1 Clement and 1 Peter have the same authority for Polycarp as does Paul, but Polycarp only mentions Paul specifically because of Paul’s authority with the Philippian recipients.<sup>34</sup> Our study has therefore revealed that the impetus in Polycarp’s choice of texts is not quasi-Marcionite theology, but paraenetic purpose.

On the other hand, Meinhold had earlier argued that Polycarp’s reference to the prophets’ predictions of the Lord’s coming (*Phil* 6.3) was written *against* Marcion’s canonical views.<sup>35</sup> According to our reconstruction, Polycarp would not have been writing against Marcion. But *Phil*’s juxtaposition of the Apostles who brought the Gospel and the Prophets who foretold the Lord reveals that he had not discarded Old Testament literature as an authority. This pairing of the Prophets and the Gospel was similarly employed by Ignatius (*Philadelphians* 5.1–2; 9.1–2; *Smyrnaeans* 5.1, 7.2).<sup>36</sup>

### Polycarp and “Scripture”

Fourth, did Polycarp consider the texts now in our New Testament to be “Scripture”? The controversy surrounds *Phil* 12, which states:

---

<sup>31</sup> Massaux, *Influence*, 183.

<sup>32</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 283.

<sup>33</sup> Dehandschutter notes, “As such, Polycarp’s use of Paul does not differ essentially from his use of 1 Peter or 1 Clement!” (*ibid.*, 282).

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 283.

<sup>35</sup> Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1685.

<sup>36</sup> See D. M. Farskasfalvy, “‘Prophets and Apostles’: The Conjunction of the Two Terms before Irenaeus,” in *Texts and Testaments*, ed. W. E. March (San Antonio: Trinity University, 1980), 109–134. Problems would undoubtedly have arisen between Ignatius and Polycarp if the latter had held Marcionite tendencies (cf. Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1665).

For I am confident that you are well-trained in the Scriptures, and nothing is hidden from you. But to myself this is not granted. Only, as it is said in these Scriptures, “Be angry and do not sin,” and “Let not the sun set on your wrath.” Blessed is the one who remembers this; and I trust that it is so with you.<sup>37</sup>

Lightfoot and Harrison concur that behind the Latin *scripturis* stands a Greek γράφαῖς, and there seems to be no cause for disagreement.<sup>38</sup> In the New Testament writings, the term γράφαί (which may mean merely “writings”) always refers to sacred writings or Scriptures; the Scriptures are clearly in view in *Phil* 12.1 where Polycarp refers to the *sacris literis*. Is this passage very early evidence of Christians calling New Testament material “Scripture,” since Polycarp juxtaposes a quotation from Psalms with one from Ephesians and seems to call them both Scripture?<sup>39</sup>

Possible solutions to this problem include: 1) Although Polycarp does refer to Ephesians as “Scripture,” the present text is a corruption or an interpolation.<sup>40</sup> Donaldson is inclined to consider *ut dictum est his Scripturis* as an insertion. The original would then read, “For I am confident that you are well-trained in the Scriptures. But to myself this is not granted. Only, ‘Be angry and do not sin,’ and ‘Let not the sun set on your wrath.’” 2) Polycarp awkwardly uses “Scriptures” of “Be angry and do not sin” (a quote from Psalms), but not also of “Let not the sun set on your wrath” (a quote from Ephesians).<sup>41</sup> 3) Polycarp was citing from memory and mistakenly took both quotes to be from the Old Testament because of their juxtaposition in Ephesians 4:26.<sup>42</sup> Dehandschutter finds this unlikely “in a context which focuses on the Philippians’ knowledge of Scripture,”<sup>43</sup> but his argument is not conclusive; we are again reminded of the rhetorical context of

---

<sup>37</sup> One manuscript reads *Non est concessum uti his Scripturis, dictum est enim . . . for Mihi autem non est concessum. Modo, ut his Scripturis dictum est . . .* But this rendition “does not make a whit better sense than the other” (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 243).

<sup>38</sup> Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 344; cf. Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 334; Nielsen notes similar instances of γράφαί being translated as *scripturae* (Nielsen, “Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures,” 200).

<sup>39</sup> 1 Timothy 5:18 contains a similar interpretational question (for a brief introduction to the problem, see Grant, *Formation*, 30–31).

<sup>40</sup> Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 243.

<sup>41</sup> Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 113.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>43</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’ Epistle,” 282.

disavowal. 4) Polycarp was aware that the phrase “let not the sun go down on your anger” contains weak allusions to Jeremiah 15:9 and Deuteronomy 24:13.<sup>44</sup> 5) Polycarp does refer to both Psalms and Ephesians as “Scripture.” Blackman concludes that Polycarp “definitely” regards Ephesians as Scripture.<sup>45</sup> Dehandschutter argues that *Phil* 12 is a “clear reference” to the quotation of Ephesians as Scripture.<sup>46</sup> Lindemann has continued to hold this option; he believes the evidence demonstrates that although Marcion was probably the main impetus to any process of canonization, others at the same time or earlier were thinking (perhaps unthematically) of New Testament documents as “Scripture.”<sup>47</sup> Nielsen and Kümmel go on to conclude that of all the New Testament works, Polycarp considered only Pauline material to be “Scripture,” and that he agreed with Marcion in this perspective.<sup>48</sup> Of course there is another alternative: 6) Polycarp does not realize that the first quotation is in Psalms but believes they are both from Ephesians. In this case, Polycarp would only be applying “Scripture” to Ephesians. This alternative has not found a wide following, though it would fit the view of those who find Marcionite tendencies in Polycarp.<sup>49</sup> Polycarp’s sparse use of the Old Testament and frequent stress upon Paul might add weight to this final option, even for those, like myself, who are not inclined to label *Phil* as having “Marcionite tendencies.”

Nielsen provides what he believes to be four principles to aid in the interpretation of this passage. (1) “In the first place, if being ‘well versed in the sacred Scriptures’ means being able to quote passages accurately and being able to refer to the text for long quotations, then Polycarp does not appear to be well versed, even in the Pauline corpus.” (2) “In the second place, Polycarp may have had the Old Testament *partly* in mind during his profession of ignorance, and insofar as he does, his statement is painfully accurate.” (3) “In the third place, to appear humble is an occupational requirement and hazard for a bishop.” (4) “In

---

<sup>44</sup> Barnett, *Paul*, 180.

<sup>45</sup> Blackman, *Marcion*, 30.

<sup>46</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 282.

<sup>47</sup> Lindemann, *Paulus*, 228.

<sup>48</sup> Nielsen, “Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures,” 199–216. Idem, “Polycarp and Marcion,” 298; Kümmel, *Introduction*, 484 n.28.

<sup>49</sup> Nielsen hints at this option, but does not seem to adopt it (Nielsen, “Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures,” 201); Marshall does seem to believe *Phil* 12.1 comes from Ephesians in its entirety (Marshall, “Use,” 41, 45).

the fourth place, in comparison with the Church at Philippi, which was founded by Paul himself, perhaps Polycarp was not well versed in Paul's writings."<sup>50</sup> However, difficulties arise in the application of Nielsen's principles: By the combination of (1) and (4) above, are we to conclude that the Philippians, unlike Paul, could quote long passages accurately from various Pauline epistles?

*Phil* 12.1 begins, "For I am confident that you are well versed in the Scriptures, and from you nothing is hid."<sup>51</sup> The next phrase poses a translation difficulty since it includes an unclear antecedent: *mihi autem non est concessum*. Schoedel grants that the "more natural translation" of 12.1 would be "But that <knowledge of Scripture>, however, has not been granted to me"; and he concedes that "Such humility would scarcely be beyond the spiritual capacities of Polycarp."<sup>52</sup> Nevertheless, Schoedel argues that Polycarp did in fact know the Scriptures from childhood, and he therefore prefers a different rendition: "But that <teaching or application of your knowledge of Scripture> has not been left to me." On the other hand, Farmer accepts the "more natural translation" of this passage, but he claims that Polycarp's humble assessment of his knowledge of Scripture clearly must refer to the Jewish writings, since he manifests a vast knowledge of the Christian Scriptures.<sup>53</sup>

Such arguments seem to take a customary humble disavowal too literally. Polycarp is using a common rhetorical ploy. Even though he obviously betrays an astute knowledge of various New Testament works, the rhetorical minimizing of his scriptural knowledge in 12.1 may still refer to them. Furthermore, *Phil*'s stress upon Christian texts as well as upon Paul specifically (3.2, 9.1, 11.2–3) may argue for the application of "Scriptures" to Ephesians in 12.1. Polycarp's application of the verb ἐγκύπτω to the Pauline letters in *Phil* 3.2 may also reveal Polycarp's authoritative elevation of (at least some) New Testament documents, since *1 Clement* consistently uses the verb with the Jewish Scriptures.<sup>54</sup>

Outside of this instance in *Phil* 12.1, Schoedel (following Koester), argues that the formula "as Paul teaches" in 11.2 suggests that "an apostle is not yet regarded

---

<sup>50</sup> Nielsen, "Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures," 204.

<sup>51</sup> Lake considers this to be an allusion to the letter of the Philippians to Polycarp (Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 299; cf. Grant, *Formation*, 105).

<sup>52</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 35.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 70; cf. Schoedel, "Polycarp, Epistle of."

<sup>54</sup> *1 Clement* 45.2; 53.1; 62.3.

as one who has written Scripture.”<sup>55</sup> But Nielsen contends that the authority invested in Paul *as apostle* has now been transferred to the *writings* of Paul.<sup>56</sup> One may still heed the warning not to confuse Polycarp’s consideration of a text as Scripture and the *formal canonical* status of the New Testament.<sup>57</sup> The Pauline epistles may have possessed a special status related to their apostolic authority apart from their inclusion in a larger fixed “canon” of the “New Testament.”

In sum, Polycarp seems to have used the label “Scriptures” for Ephesians (and perhaps the Psalms as well).<sup>58</sup> The “word of truth” was propounded by the apostles, whether orally or in writing.<sup>59</sup> And the authority of the apostolic texts was related to the authority which resided in the apostles as preservers of the authoritative message.<sup>60</sup> The issue of what texts constituted the “canon” of the “New Testament” was not always dominant in early Christian communities.<sup>61</sup> Eventually, the apostolic authority began to be viewed primarily as remaining in texts.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 32; cf. Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung*, 113. Donaldson argues that the phrase did not appear in the original (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 245). Lindemann avers that it is “not impossible” that the Latin translator inserted the phrase (Lindemann, “Paulus,” 42). But this seems unnecessary. Although the phrase only appears in the Latin, and although Polycarp does not name his sources elsewhere, he does explicitly refer to Paul at other times.

<sup>56</sup> Nielsen, “Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures,” 212.

<sup>57</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 282; cf. Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 23 n.1.

<sup>58</sup> Campenhausen’s contention that Irenaeus was the first orthodox writer to use “Scripture” of the New Testament is false (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 186). See footnote 105.

<sup>59</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 106.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. the Apostolic Fathers’ references to “the prophets,” “the apostles,” and “the Lord” (Grant, *Formation*, 104). Cf. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III.1.1.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Serapion’s critique of the *Gospel of Peter* (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI.12.3–6). As Grant surmises, “The question was not, ‘Are these books to be counted as “scripture”?’ but ‘Are these books apostolic and orthodox?’” (Grant, *Formation*, 150). Even in the late second century, Irenaeus was not as concerned with the “scriptural” status of books as the true preservation of the apostolic tradition (*ibid.*, 156).

<sup>62</sup> Campenhausen, *Formation of the Christian Bible*, 203–209. Campenhausen argues that Irenaeus evidences a change as Christian “scripture” is used against the heretics (*ibid.*, 186–187, 208–209). “In its crucial sections, therefore, which make up more than half the total work, the *Adversus haereses* is nothing less than a comprehensive and continuous proof from Scripture, and the Scripture in question is ‘New Testament’” (*ibid.*, 187). Cf. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* II.35; III.pref.; III.12.9. Montanism may also have played a part in the limiting of revelation (*ibid.*, 211; Blackman, *Marcion*, 32 n.1).

## Polycarp and the New Testament Canon

Fifth, our reconstruction reveals an important development in the use and interpretation of New Testament literature. The history of the New Testament canon can be reconstructed based upon three lines of evidence:<sup>63</sup> (1) the use of documents by writers in the early Church; (2) explicit discussions (by individuals or councils) about the acceptance or rejection of certain documents; and (3) the contents of ancient manuscripts of the New Testament. Polycarp's use of authoritative texts falls within the first, early category. As Farkasfalvy notes, the development of the New Testament during the first half of the second century is "the most crucial period."<sup>64</sup>

Undoubtedly, the early history of the collection of the New Testament is "a narrow path, roughly paved and poorly lit,"<sup>65</sup> but Polycarp is a lamp that helps illumine the way. Farmer writes,

There can be little doubt that Polycarp's library of Christian writings is the purest touchstone that we have of the emerging New Testament canon that is later evidenced in the writings of Irenaeus, the critical reflections of Origen, and the literary and historical investigations of Eusebius.<sup>66</sup>

Gregory refers to Polycarp as the keystone of the arch that supports the history of the Church and the New Testament from the time of the apostles to the close of the second century.<sup>67</sup> Whether one agrees that Polycarp calls Ephesians "Scripture" in 12.1, Polycarp definitely uses New Testament works in an authoritative way.<sup>68</sup> Other contemporary writers, such as Clement and Ignatius, had already juxtaposed quotations from the Old Testament with the sayings of the Lord or the teachings of the apostles.<sup>69</sup> Farkasfalvy asserts, "In such exegetical practice the principles of a Christian canon of Holy Scriptures already make their

---

<sup>63</sup> Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 23.

<sup>64</sup> Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 123.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 124.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 71.

<sup>67</sup> C. R. Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1929), 73–75.

<sup>68</sup> Donaldson's contention that none of Polycarp's quotations "are proof of any authority being ascribed to the New Testament books" seems peculiar (Donaldson, *Apostolical Fathers*, 244). Similarly, it is readily evident that 1 Corinthians is an authoritative text for Ignatius (Grant, *Formation*, 94).

<sup>69</sup> Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 125.

first appearance with more or less explicitness.”<sup>70</sup> *1 Clement* parallels the apostles and the prophets in two respects: their preaching shared the same authority of divine origin from the Spirit (*1 Clement* 42:3; 47:2; 45:2) and they both suffered rejection leading to martyrdom (*1 Clement* 4–5; Ignatius, *Magnesians* 8.2).<sup>71</sup> This combination of “prophets” and “apostles” is a common early Christian theme (cf. 2 Peter 3:2; Ignatius, *Philadelphians* 8.1–2; *Phil* 6.3).<sup>72</sup>

Ignatius stressed the authority of the “Gospel” as well as the prophets and apostles.<sup>73</sup> Justin also juxtaposes the “prophets” and the “apostles,” but with two important alterations. First, he stresses the order of “apostles and prophets” (*Dialogue with Trypho* 199.6).<sup>74</sup> Second, he refers to the *written* documents of the two groups;<sup>75</sup> he speaks of the Sunday liturgical reading of the “compilations” of the prophets and “memoirs” of the apostles (Justin, *Apology* 1.67.3).<sup>76</sup> *2 Clement* speaks of καὶ τὰ βιβλία καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι (*2 Clement* 14:2). The *Epistle to Diognetus* states, “Then fear of the Law is sung and the grace of the prophets is recognized and the faith of the gospels is established and the tradition of the apostles is guarded” (*Epistle to Diognetus* 11.6). Irenaeus routinely juxtaposes the prophets and the apostles as collections of writings.<sup>77</sup> Irenaeus continues the convention of reversing the earlier traditional order: “As the Lord himself testifies, and the Apostles confess, and the prophets announce” (*Adversus haereses* III.17.4). The Muratorian canon seems to use “prophets” and “apostles” of the Old and New Testaments, respectively.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 125–126.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 55–56; 124. Farkasfalvy notes the importance of martyrdom specifically in the creation of the canon (Farkasfalvy, “Prophets,” 109–134).

<sup>72</sup> See Farkasfalvy, “Prophets.”

<sup>73</sup> *Philadelphians* 5.1–2; 9.1–2. Here the “Gospel” does not seem to refer a specific text but the entire Christ event. Farkasfalvy refers to a “proto-Canon” present in Ignatius and Polycarp (Farkasfalvy, “Prophets,” 127).

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 141.

<sup>75</sup> Westcott argued that Ignatius’ juxtaposition of the “apostles” with the “prophets” referred to the written documents of the apostles, or Gospels. Lightfoot concurred and broadened the meaning to include both Gospels and epistles (Blackman, *Marcion*, 29 n.3). However, the reference to the “apostles” may refer to the personal authority residing in the individuals.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 142.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 144.

<sup>78</sup> Campenhausen, *Formation*, 257, 263. For an introduction to the problem of dating the *Muratorian Canon*, see my chapter 2.



Of course, Polycarp is partly moved to this authoritative use of Christian texts because of his audience and partly because of the occasion (the most natural place to find material pertaining to the treatment of a church leader is in the Christian writings). Thus, Polycarp supplies us with an early (c. A.D. 115) example of the application of early Christian literature to a specific church crisis.<sup>79</sup> Although the idea of a limited canon is not developed in Polycarp's mind, he has no qualms in treating the New Testament books as authoritative texts. Dehandschutter's words are fitting:

We think, however, that Polycarp was primarily looking for a specifically *Christian* paraenetical tradition, capable also of being similarly identified by the Philippians. His *originality* consists precisely in the fact that again and again he refers to earlier Christian literature in order to instruct the Philippians in the right way of solving the Valens-case by means of *Christian* conduct, not by following current Judeo-hellenistic models.<sup>80</sup>

As we might expect at this early stage, Polycarp's range of authoritative texts is wider than our New Testament: he quotes *1 Clement*; and just as he maintains that Paul's letters "build up in the faith" (*Phil* 3), he also affirms that the Philippians would "benefit greatly" from Ignatius' letters, "for they contain faith, patience, and all the edification which pertains to our Lord" (*Phil* 13).<sup>81</sup>

Although the understanding is developing, situations like that which Polycarp faced were opportunities for the early Church to recognize Christian sources as authoritative material similar to that of the Old Testament.

That is, certain writings were found to be specially helpful in sustaining, enriching, renewing, and directing the faith and life of the churches. As a result, those writings came to be valued and widely employed in Christian worship and teaching alongside the Jewish scriptures and in some ways proved even more useful than the Jewish scriptures. It was on the basis of this sustained experience of their usefulness that the church recognized them as constituting "scripture."<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Campenhausen notes that "the New <Testament> was consolidated in the process of the use which individual churches – with the critical and controlling participation of their intellectual leaders – made of the corpus of primitive Christian writing" (see Campenhausen, *Formation*, 331). Campenhausen, of course, uses this phenomenon of the post-Marcionite Church, but the roots of the process seems to hold true much earlier.

<sup>80</sup> Dehandschutter, "Polycarp's Epistle," 285.

<sup>81</sup> Blackman wonders whether this is "a tendency to canonize Ignatius" (Blackman, *Marcion*, 26).

<sup>82</sup> Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 19.

The process of canonization did not primarily include making lists to the *exclusion* of texts (Marcion), but the authoritative application of texts in new situations resulting in their implicit *inclusion*. Thus, the New Testament documents were a functional “canon” before they were a “formal” canon.<sup>83</sup> The process of textual canonization arose from an understanding of authoritative apostolic doctrine which “canonical” texts enshrined: a canon of apostolicity preceded an apostolic canon.

For this reason the history of the canon cannot finally be differentiated from the history of interpretation. The canon consists of those writings which came into traditional use and authoritative esteem precisely because they lent themselves to meaningful appropriation by Christian communities in later and different circumstances.<sup>84</sup>

The recognition of the canon was “an act of intuition of the Church” in its “natural growth” of “self-consciousness.”<sup>85</sup>

Farkasfalvy has noted the juxtaposition of Old Testament texts and apostolic teaching as equal authorities of divine origin in both *1 Clement* and Ignatius.<sup>86</sup> In Ignatius specifically, the real center of normativity is found in the Christ event. All three members of the triad of prophets, gospel, and apostles are important (*Philadelphians* 5.1–2; 9.1–2), but Christ is central:

For I heard some men saying, “If I find it not in the charters, I do not believe in the Gospel,” and when I said to them that it is in the Scripture, they answered me, “that is exactly the question.” But to me the charters are Jesus Christ, the inviolable charter is his

---

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., 18 n.14; cf. Blackman’s differentiation between the idea of a canon and the fixation of the canon (Blackman, *Marcion*, 23, 32). Campenhausen sees only one use of “canon”: “One can, in my view, speak of a ‘canon’ only where of set purpose such a document or group of documents is given a special, normative position, by virtue of which it takes its place alongside the existing Old Testament ‘scripture’” (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 103). The church had long referred to the “Canon of Truth” or *regula fidei*, which summarized the content of the faith (ibid., 182). A. C. Sundberg, “Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon,” *Studia Evangelica* 4 (1968): 460ff. Cf. Bauer’s discussion of the role of the *regular fidei* in Polycarp (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 22–23).

<sup>84</sup> Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 74.

<sup>85</sup> B. F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1880), 53.

<sup>86</sup> Farkasfalvy, “Prophets.” Cf. Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 124–128.

cross, and death, and resurrection, and the faith which is through him; – in these I desire to be justified by your prayers (*Philadelphians* 8.2; English translation in *LCL*).<sup>87</sup>

In Ignatius' opinion, Judaizers had "an exaggerated idea of the self-sufficiency" of the Hebrew writings.<sup>88</sup> The prophets anticipated the Gospel, and the Apostles transmitted it. Similarly, it is interesting how the Apostolic Fathers juxtapose dominical traditions ("the Lord") and Pauline traditions ("the apostle") as Christian authorities (cf. *1 Clement* 46–47; *Magnesians* 13.1; *Philadelphians* 5:1; 9.1–2).<sup>89</sup> Polycarp's exhortation fits well within this context: "So then, 'let us serve him with fear and all reverence,' as he himself commanded us, and as did the Apostles, who brought us the Gospel, and the Prophets who foretold the coming of our Lord" (*Phil* 6.3).

The authority which rested in Christian teaching already contained the germ of the later Christian canon. It is clear that the final authority in the early Church lay in the apostolic teaching, not in the Jewish Scriptures used as demonstration. In fact, one must speak of the authority of the *Christianized* Old Testament in the early Church. The apostolic teaching was recognized in certain written texts.<sup>90</sup> Once the written documents were being formed into collections, the rule of faith and the worship of the church were united with the Scriptures in normativity and interpretation.<sup>91</sup>

Furthermore, Christianity grew most rapidly among the Gentiles (especially in places like Philippi). These converts often were not knowledgeable in the Jewish

---

<sup>87</sup> See Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 247 n.1 about the translation difficulties.

<sup>88</sup> Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 15. For an introduction to Ignatius' reference to the "archives" as well as arguments for its interpretation as the Hebrew Scriptures, see W. R. Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Archives," *Harvard Theological Review* 71 (1978): 97–106. Petersen considered the "archives" to be miracle collections, Reinach supposed they were public legal documents, and Klewinghaus thought that they were Jewish Gnostic Gospels; but none of these theories are very commendable (E. Peterson, *Eis theos* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), 216–221; W. Reinach, "Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and Archeia," in *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, ed. W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder (Manchester: University of Manchester, 1923), 339ff); J. Klewinghaus, *Die theologische Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur alttestamentlichen Offenbarung* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1948), 78–112).

<sup>89</sup> Lindemann, "Paul," 34.

<sup>90</sup> R. A. Greer, "Scriptural Authority (in the Early Church)," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. D. N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*

Scriptures, and the use of Christian documents became more and more common.<sup>92</sup> Christian documents came to be read in Christian worship. Gradually, it was taken for granted that the two collections of Scriptures were authoritative for the Church.<sup>93</sup>

If Polycarp's authoritative use of certain texts is one piece of the canonical puzzle, then Polycarp's use of Paul demonstrates that Pauline material was eventually included for reasons other than only as a reaction to Marcion.<sup>94</sup> Harnack claimed that Marcion was the "creator" of the canon, and that the "catholic" New Testament was an anti-Marcionite creation on a Marcionite foundation.<sup>95</sup> Knox also advocated such a position.<sup>96</sup> He wrote, "The structural principle of Marcion's canon became the organizing idea of the catholic New Testament. . . . Marcion is primarily responsible for the idea of the New Testament."<sup>97</sup> But this reductionism is not the entire story. Aland confidently says of Marcion, "There is no element, neither in dogmatics nor in the development of the canon, of which we can say that without him it would not have been introduced or would have been different."<sup>98</sup> Furthermore, from its inception, the notion of canon was associated with the assumption that "zu einem solchen Kanon müßten auch die paulinischen Briefe gehören."<sup>99</sup> *Phil* stands as a testimony to these realities.

---

<sup>92</sup> Blackman, *Marcion*, 24.

<sup>93</sup> Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 58–59.

<sup>94</sup> Lindemann, "Paul," 325 n.12.

<sup>95</sup> Harnack, *Marcion*, 196–215, 42–42\*, 441\*ff.

<sup>96</sup> Knox, *Marcion*. He later wrote of this volume that "The general thesis of the book is in my judgment still defensible and I am persuaded of its truth" (J. Knox, "Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 287 n.8). Marcion's action "stimulated, and determined the definitive form of, both Luke-Acts and the ecclesiastical canon of the New Testament" (*ibid.*).

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 31. Knox hedges, "This does not mean . . . that opposition to Marcionism was the only factor contributing to the creation of a distinctively Christian canon of Scriptures. Many other factors were at work which would eventually have produced a New Testament of some kind. I am merely urging that Marcion's canon served as the decisive occasion of its creation, just as the addition of a single element to a highly complex chemical solution often produces the precipitate" (*ibid.*, 161).

<sup>98</sup> B. Aland, "Marcion: Versuch einer neuen Interpretation," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70 (1973): 420–447.

<sup>99</sup> Lindemann, *Paulus*, 35.

This present study adds weight to the contentions of those who have argued that the views of scholars such as Harnack and Knox that Marcion was the “creator” “of the Christian holy scripture” must be modified.<sup>100</sup> Similarly, one must revise Campenhausen’s arguments that the idea of a new “scripture” began “at one stroke with Marcion and only with Marcion,” that the Church “from a formal point of view simply followed his example,” and that “the first Christian canon remains his peculiar and unique creation, one in which neither churchman nor gnostic anticipated him.”<sup>101</sup> In the end, Polycarp’s use of New Testament documents proves that the appeal to Gospel and apostle was current before Marcion’s time,<sup>102</sup> that a Pauline collection was available before Marcion, and that the “catholic” canon’s larger parameters were seminally realized before Marcion.<sup>103</sup> Marcion neither started the process of canonization nor provided its contours. The Petrine and Johannine *corpora* were not included simply to balance the influence of Paul (and hence Marcion).<sup>104</sup> Nor did Marcion give the New Testament its “scriptural authority.”<sup>105</sup> “In the absence of stronger evidence, it is gratuitous to see in Marcion a decisive factor in the history of the NT canon.”<sup>106</sup> Marcion’s real innovation was expurgating “the prophets” from the authorities of

---

<sup>100</sup> See Harnack, *Marcion*, 241–247; 84; Knox, *Marcion*, 19ff.

<sup>101</sup> Campenhausen, *Formation*, 148.

<sup>102</sup> Contra Knox, *Marcion*, 114–117. Campenhausen argues that Marcion was the first to use εὐαγγέλιον for a written text (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 155). But Köhler is open to εὐαγγέλιον referring to a written gospel in the *Martyrdom* (see Dehandschutter, “Martyrium Polycarpi,” 507).

<sup>103</sup> Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 60–61. G. Quispel maintains that Marcion simply incorporated the text of the New Testament available in Rome prior to 144 (Quispel, “Marcion,” 349–360).

<sup>104</sup> E. Evans, *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), xvi.

<sup>105</sup> Contra Goodspeed, *Formation*, 48–49, 74; cf. Harnack, *Die Briefsammlung*, 21. Even apart from “orthodox” writers, Marcion may not have been the first to refer to the New Testament literature as “scripture” (Grant, *Formation*, 123). Basilides used ἡ γραφή of Ephesians and introduced a quote from 1 Corinthians with ὡς γέγραπται (Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 7, 13–14). Clement of Alexandria places Basilides in the reign of Hadrian. Thus Blackman considers Basilides to be the first to quote the New Testament as Scripture on par with the Old Testament (Blackman *Marcion*, 30 n. 4). According to Clement, Valentinus also cited Ephesians as Scripture (*Stromateis* 6.34). Furthermore, the *Epistle of Barnabas* seems to rank Pauline material on the level of Scripture with the Old Testament. And 2 Peter 3:15–16 refers to the Pauline epistles as Scripture (see also 1 Timothy 5:18).

<sup>106</sup> Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 62.

normativity and exchanging “the apostles” for “*the* apostle” (Paul).<sup>107</sup> Although Harnack benefited scholarship with his reassessment of Marcion, in the end his “too intense preoccupation” with the Pontic heretic caused him to become “short-sighted.”<sup>108</sup> Exaggerations of Marcion’s influence “can be accepted as fact only by those who, like Harnack, are so much in love with Marcion that they accept with enthusiasm any theory which magnifies his importance.”<sup>109</sup>

Finally, perhaps Polycarp influenced Irenaeus. The seeds that are present in Polycarp come to fruition in Irenaeus. Irenaeus does not seem to hesitate in labeling the apostolic writings as “Scriptures” (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.20.26).

And though Irenaeus does not yet know of a *closed* second Canon and though he does not assign to it the name ‘the books of the New Covenant,’ still in his exposition he proceeds as if it were really closed – the name only is wanting, the thing itself is practically in existence for him.<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 138–139. “Thus Marcion did not initiate the notion of the Canon but attempted to reform an already-existing body of normative writings” (Balás, “Marcion Revisited,” 103). On the other hand, Zahn perhaps overstates, “In ausgesprochenem Gegensatz zu den hl. Schriften der Kirche, von welcher Marcion ausschied, hat er seine Bibel gestaltet” (T. Zahn, *Geschichte des Kanons*, vol. 1: *Das Neue Testament von Origenes* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1888), 586). The recognition of authoritative Scripture was still in a state of flux. Cf. the more balanced statement of Bauer: “Was den Prozeß der Kanonbildung anbelangt, sieht man bei Polykarp ein fortgeschrittenes Stadium, aber noch klar vormarkionitisch und also jedenfalls auch vormontanistisch” (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 23).

<sup>108</sup> Blackman, *Marcion*, 12; cf. Barnikol’s overstatements of Marcion’s influence (*ibid.*, 21).

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>110</sup> A. von Harnack, *The Origin of the New Testament and the Most Important Consequences of the New Creation* (London: Macmillan, 1925), 40.

## Chapter 13

# Polycarp and Paul

## Polycarp and the Legacy of Paul

First, this study modifies the views of those who have claimed that Paul's theological legacy was forgotten (or even deliberately set aside) by the "catholic" church, only used as an authority by Gnostic Christians for some time, and later recovered by the addition of the Pastorals and/or Acts to the canon. According to one reconstruction, Paul's influence went through three stages in the second century.<sup>1</sup> (1) He enjoyed great popularity at the turn of the century<sup>2</sup> (as witnessed by Ephesians, Revelation, 1 Peter, Hebrews, *1 Clement*, the Johannine Epistles, Ignatius, and Polycarp). (2) His popularity waned as heretics made use of his letters (as evidenced by James, Jude, *Hermas*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, *Didache*, *2 Clement*, and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*). (3) His letters returned to popularity again (as demonstrated by 2 Peter, Justin, and the Pastorals). "The Church had herself first to rediscover Paul, before she could overcome gnostic Paulinism."<sup>3</sup>

Certainly Paul was used frequently by various heretics in the mid-second century,<sup>4</sup> including Basilides,<sup>5</sup> Valentinus,<sup>6</sup> Ptolemy,<sup>7</sup> Heracleon, Theodotus,<sup>8</sup> and especially Marcion.<sup>9</sup> Tertullian even labeled Paul "*apostolus haereticorum*" and

---

<sup>1</sup> This is Barnett's reconstruction (Barnett, *Paul*). It relies upon the previous works of Harnack and Bauer; for a brief description of their views, see de Boer, "Which Paul," 45–46.

<sup>2</sup> According to Goodspeed, this surge in popularity was due to the publication of Acts (Goodspeed, *Formation*, 20–21).

<sup>3</sup> Campenhausen, *Formation*, 145.

<sup>4</sup> See *ibid.*, 144–146, 177–181.

<sup>5</sup> Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, III.2.1; Origen, *Commentary on Romans*, 5.1.

<sup>6</sup> Valentinus, *Evangelium Veritatis*, 45.24f.

<sup>7</sup> Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, I.3.4–5; I.8.2–5.

<sup>8</sup> Clement of Alexandria, *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 24.1; 50.3; 47.3; 62.2; 66.

<sup>9</sup> U. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995). "As Harnack has said, Marcion was the only man in the second century who really tried to understand Paul, and he misunderstood him" (Goodspeed, *Formation*, 44).

discussed his place as Marcion's apostle.<sup>10</sup> At the same time, the use of Paul seems to be conspicuously absent among some mid-century "orthodox" authors<sup>11</sup> (including Justin,<sup>12</sup> Papias, and Hegesippus<sup>13</sup>). Some interpreters have thus surmised that "Paul was the heretics' apostle, and it was wise to be cautious in using him,"<sup>14</sup> but that he comes back in full force with Irenaeus.<sup>15</sup>

Yet, on the other hand, Paul was not the only apostolic authority claimed by Gnostic Christianity. Heretics could also make use of John and Peter, even referring to one or the other as ὁ ἀπόστολος.<sup>16</sup> Some Gnostic works could manifest no Pauline influence.<sup>17</sup> And, as we shall see, the "Great Church" did not completely abandon Paul. Why could not the early Church completely disregard the figure of Paul? Wagenmann gives three reasons: (1) The Pauline Corpus was known and read in many churches. (2) Paul himself was responsible for establishing many of the churches. (3) He was already widely used for doctrinal support.<sup>18</sup>

Bauer argues that Paul was rescued from the heretics by adding the Pastoral Epistles to the Pauline collection and by employing Acts.<sup>19</sup> But we have seen that

<sup>10</sup> Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* III.5 (PL 2.327); 5.1.

<sup>11</sup> Barrett, "Pauline Controversies," 230.

<sup>12</sup> Justin does use Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, and Ephesians. But he never explicitly refers to Paul or cites his letters by name (Goodspeed, *Formation*, 55). Grant attempts to find other reasons for this phenomenon (Justin wrote for non-Christians and did not want to raise the issue of Paul's place in Christianity, and Paul himself addressed Christians), but the Marcionite controversy in Rome remains a possibility (*ibid.*, 136). Cf. Campenhausen's comments, who sees Pauline influence on Justin, but argues that it is "understandable" that he "ignores Paul altogether" (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 98–99). See also pseudo-Justin (*cf. ibid.*, 178).

<sup>13</sup> Campenhausen notes that Hegesippus leaves Paul out of his "canonical" authorities (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.22.3), and that he seemingly condemns a passage from 1 Corinthians (Stephanus Gobarus in Photius, *Bibliotheca* 232) (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 178). But Hegesippus praises the faith of the Corinthian church (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.22), and his list of authorities seems tied to his Palestinian environment (hence James and Peter).

<sup>14</sup> Barrett, "Pauline Controversies," 237.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 235.

<sup>16</sup> Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 133.

<sup>17</sup> Rensberger, "As the Apostle Teaches," 360–361.

<sup>18</sup> J. Wagenmann, *Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten* (Geißen: Töpelmann, 1926), 154ff. See also, Knox, "Acts," 283.

<sup>19</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 212–228; *cf.* W. Schneemelcher, "Paulus in der griechischen Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 75 (1964): 1–20. Campenhausen,



Polycarp was already using the Pastorals early in the second century. Knox further developed a late dating for Acts.<sup>20</sup> He contended that the editor of Luke-Acts edited the Gospel of Luke and composed Acts in order to challenge Marcionism. The writer of Acts did so by stressing the continuity of Christianity with Judaism and by emphasizing the harmony between Paul and the other apostles.

I regard Luke-Acts as being under one of its aspects an early apologetic response to Marcionism. The 'Gospel and Apostle' of 'Luke' follow the 'Gospel and Apostle' of Marcion, as they also anticipate the 'Gospel and Apostle' of the official canon. The author of Luke-Acts sought to reclaim both a Gospel and Paul from the Marcionites.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, for Knox, Acts "catholicized" Paul and the Luke-Acts order mirrored Marcion's Luke-Paul canon. But *Phil* provides some evidence of the pre-Marcionite use of Acts as well.<sup>22</sup> Knox must also argue that the editor of Luke-Acts elongated Marcion's Luke, contrary to the ancient testimony that Marcion shortened an original Luke.<sup>23</sup>

---

*Formation*, 144–145, 177–181; Barrett, "Pauline Controversies," 229–245; G. Strecker, "Paulus in nachpaulinischer Zeit," *Kairos* 12 (1970); Knox, *Marcion*, 114–139. See Rensberger's examination of this perspective (Rensberger, "As the Apostle Teaches," 1–45).

<sup>20</sup> Tyson laments, "If Knox's work on Acts as a source for Pauline biography has met with moderate success, his work on Marcion and Acts has been almost totally ignored" (Tyson, "John Knox," 70).

<sup>21</sup> Knox, *Marcion*, 139. Knox dates Acts c. A.D. 125 (Knox, "Acts," 285–286). Townsend agrees with Knox's general reconstruction (J. T. Townsend, "The Contributions of John Knox to the Study of Acts: Some Further Notations," in *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts*, ed. M. C. Parsons and J. B. Tyson (Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), 87–89).

<sup>22</sup> Branscomb further argues that not much material in Acts is really relevant to the Marcionite crisis anyway (H. Branscomb, "Second Century Christianity Re-Examined," *Christendom* 8 (1943): 408–410). Tyson admits that there is "precious little" anti-Marcionite material in Acts (Tyson, "John Knox," 77).

<sup>23</sup> More exactly, Knox believed that a type of proto-Luke (primarily lacking the Lukan *Sondergut*) "was somewhat shortened by Marcion or some predecessor and rather considerably enlarged by the writer of our Gospel, who was also the maker of Luke-Acts (Knox, *Marcion*, 110; cf. also *ibid.*, 106–113; 163–170). Tyson and Townsend also attempt to downplay the ancient evidence (Tyson, "John Knox," 70; Townsend, "Contributions," 87). But cf. Blackman, *Marcion*, 38–41; and especially L. E. Wilshire, "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century? – A Continuing Discussion," *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 246–253. For a summary of the text of Luke available to Marcion, see Balás, "Marcion Revisited," 103.

Bauer's reconstruction places great weight on the lack of Paul in mid-century material and brushes aside earlier works (*1 Clement*, Ignatius, and Polycarp);<sup>24</sup> but as Barrett notes, "not, I think, successfully."<sup>25</sup> Bauer argues that these Apostolic Fathers only evidence knowledge of 1 Corinthians.<sup>26</sup> But Paul is far more important to Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp,<sup>27</sup> than Bauer would have us believe. The present study has revealed that Polycarp knew and used numerous Pauline works. The only apostles referred to by name among the Apostolic Fathers are Peter and Paul.<sup>28</sup> Peter is mentioned three times in the Apostolic Fathers: twice with Paul (*1 Clement* 5:4; Ignatius, *Romans* 4.3) and once in a non-canonical post-resurrection appearance story (Ignatius, *Smyrnaeans* 3.2).<sup>29</sup> Paul is mentioned more frequently. Clement explicitly mentions Paul two times (*1 Clement* 5.5–7; 47.1–4). Ignatius mentions Paul by name twice (*Ephesians* 12.2; *Romans* 4.3). Polycarp refers to Paul four times (*Phil* 3.2, 9.1, 11.2, and 11.3). As de Boer points out, Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp all refer to Paul as an apostle (*1 Clement* 5.3; 47.1; Ignatius, *Romans* 4.3; Polycarp, *Phil* 9.1), as a writer of letters to churches (*1 Clement* 47.1; Ignatius, *Ephesians* 12.2; Polycarp, *Phil* 6.2; 11.3),

---

<sup>24</sup> Cf. also Schneemelcher's belief that Ignatius and Polycarp manifest little or no influence from Pauline epistles (Schneemelcher, "Paulus," 1–20). It is generally acknowledged that Bauer's utilization of the evidence prior to the mid-second century is weaker than his use of later material. Bauer's major theme of the early and widespread presence of heresy has been generally accepted in modern scholarship, with an accompanying stress upon the diversity of early Christianity. However, many scholars have expressed various qualifications and reservations. Some have questioned Bauer's singular emphasis placed upon the "orthodox" role of Rome, his clearly visible admiration for heretics, his portrayal of the strength of heresies in various geographic locations (Robinson, *Bauer Thesis*) and his dismissal of the nature and role of tradition (Hanson, *Tradition*).

<sup>25</sup> Barrett, "Pauline Controversies," 238. For a good review of the bearing of the Apostolic Fathers on Bauer's theses, see Norris, "Ignatius," 23–44. Norris argues that two of Bauer's main theses (that heresy was earlier and/or stronger than orthodoxy in most areas of the Mediterranean basin and that Rome was the singular dominant influence in the formation of orthodoxy) must be modified. Norris further contests the view that monoepiscopacy necessarily entailed a sociological environment of an oppressed minority.

<sup>26</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 222.

<sup>27</sup> Campenhausen maintains that it was "the great service" of Polycarp to "champion the Apostle" (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 178).

<sup>28</sup> Farmer and Farkasfalvy, *Formation*, 124, 126; De Boer even argues that whenever *1 Clement* refers to "apostles," he has only Peter and Paul in mind (de Boer, "Which Paul?," 50).

<sup>29</sup> *2 Clement* 5.3–4 ties a dominical tradition concerning lambs among wolves with Peter, but I would date this work later than the early Apostolic Fathers.

and as a martyr (*1 Clement* 5.5–7; Ignatius, *Ephesians* 12.2; Polycarp, *Phil* 9.1–2).<sup>30</sup> The Apostolic Fathers use the Pauline letters more than any other New Testament texts.<sup>31</sup> *1 Clement* even refers to Paul as “truly inspired” while writing 1 Corinthians (*1 Clement* 47:2–3).

The Apostolic Fathers’ dependence upon Pauline authority may reflect a rhetorical strategy. Lindemann argues that “Clement,” Ignatius, and Polycarp did not have any formal authority over their readers,<sup>32</sup> but rather relied on the authority of the apostles, like Paul. “By quoting Paul, they apparently hoped to ‘impress’ their addressees; and they seem to have believed that they could achieve their theological purposes more effectively with such quotations than without them.”<sup>33</sup> Polycarp makes his deference to Paul explicit in *Phil* 3.1–3. There Polycarp calls Paul “blessed” (also used of Paul in *Phil* 11.3; *1 Clement* 47:1).<sup>34</sup>

Blum and Koester have argued that “For Polycarp there is no apostolic authority other than Paul.”<sup>35</sup> Nielsen agrees, “While Polycarp does not regard Paul as the only apostle, Paul is clearly the only *important* apostle.”<sup>36</sup> Nielsen contends that Polycarp “sets Paul off from the rest by the intensive use of αὐτός in 9.1.”<sup>37</sup> In this passage, Polycarp refers to the examples of endurance witnessed in Ignatius, Zosimus, Rufus, and in Paul *himself*. But most likely Polycarp stresses Paul here because he has the convictions of his readers in mind. Polycarp knew that Paul was the apostle and example par excellence to the Philippian assembly. Paul had started the church, and the Philippians and Paul had always had a strong and close relationship.

---

<sup>30</sup> De Boer, “Which Paul?,” 48.

<sup>31</sup> Lindemann, “Paul,” 28.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 29.

<sup>34</sup> The term μακάριος was not exclusively used of the dead at this time, but increasingly so (Delehay, *Sanctus*, 59–72). J. B. Bauer describes the use of μακάριος with Old Testament and New Testament characters (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 46).

<sup>35</sup> Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 307; G. G. Blum, *Tradition und Sukzession: Studien zum Normbegriff des Apostolischen von Paulus bis Irenaeus* (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlaghaus, 1963), 62. A critical question is raised by such statements: Why does Polycarp repeatedly employ 1 Peter?

<sup>36</sup> Nielsen, “Polycarp and Marcion,” 299.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 299; cf. *idem*, “Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures,” 211.

Undoubtedly, *Phil* uses "Paul" as an authority. But, as de Boer inquires, the question is "which Paul" influenced the Apostolic Fathers (the "historical Paul" reconstructed by modern criticism, the epistolary author of the canonical letters bearing his name, the character in Acts)? In the case of Polycarp, the "Paul" which seems to have the greatest influence is the "canonical" Paul.<sup>38</sup> Polycarp does not seem to rely heavily on Acts, and Polycarp of course had no cognizance of the "reconstructed Paul" of modern criticism. Polycarp would have accepted the Pauline authorship of sources such as Ephesians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy.<sup>39</sup>

De Boer, based upon Polycarp's understanding of "righteousness," further clarifies that the "Paul" who is summoned as an authority in *Phil* is less of an epistolary author than an ecclesiastical image. "There is no indication, however, that Polycarp used the Pauline letters or Pauline theology in a highly reflective way. He makes explicit use of Paul only where, for one reason or another, he finds Paul to be needed or to be useful."<sup>40</sup> According to de Boer, Polycarp is not so much interested in Paul's theology, or even his letters, but his exemplary apostolic figure.<sup>41</sup> "It seems clear . . . that at the end of the century, or very soon afterwards, the church had already developed a hagiographical portrait of Paul."<sup>42</sup> Of course, we must be cautious of drawing too sharp a distinction between the two "Pauls," the epistolary author and the ecclesiastical image (the uncontested Paul wrote 1 Corinthians as well as Romans), and we must remember that only one letter of Polycarp is extant.<sup>43</sup> Polycarp summons the authority of an "ecclesiastical" Paul rather than a "theological" Paul because the "ecclesiastical" Paul is the most appropriate image to employ in the case of Valens. Applying Paul's doctrine of justification to the case of Valens would be senseless.

Certainly, this study modifies the views of Harnack, Bauer, and others, that Paul and his theological legacy were forgotten (or even purposely rejected) by the "catholic" church and became the sole property of Gnostic Christianity, so that the

---

<sup>38</sup> De Boer, "Which Paul?," 49; Berding, "Polycarp of Smyrna's View."

<sup>39</sup> Lindemann, "Paul," 25.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>41</sup> Lindemann, *Paulus*, 71–97, 177–232.

<sup>42</sup> Barrett, "Pauline Controversies," 241.

<sup>43</sup> Polycarp's theology could have been much fuller than that represented in *Phil*. For example, if only 1 Corinthians had survived, what would one make of Paul's view of justification?

“catholic” church only “rescued” Paul after Marcion later placed the issue front and center.<sup>44</sup> Another author states,

Not only does he <Polycarp> repeatedly quote from Paul’s writings but he also stresses the personal importance of Paul as a primary authority of the Christian church. It must be remembered that at that time Paul had been adopted as a primary authority by the Gnostic heretics. Polycarp, in response, reclaimed Paul as a treasured figure of the orthodox church. It is apparently thus partly due to Polycarp that Paul, the disputed apostle, became a theologically respectable part of the Christian church’s tradition.<sup>45</sup>

These statements seem inexact to me on several counts. First, Polycarp stresses the importance of Paul as a primary authority for the *Philippian* church, and only indirectly for the Christian church at large. This is another instance of making generalizations without establishing the background of *Phil* specifically. Second, the statement about Polycarp “reclaiming” Paul seem to presuppose a late date for *Phil*. If one rejects the conflation theory, *Phil* would seem to attest the *continued* authority of Paul in at least one section of the early second-century Church. Lindemann writes, “There is certainly no basis for the notion that Paul was forgotten or unimportant in the (wing of the) church in which ‘Clement,’ Ignatius, and Polycarp did their work.”<sup>46</sup> Paul was far more important to these early church figures than some scholars would have us believe.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the Pauline collections of Tatian, the Encratites, and the Severians (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.29; Jerome, *Commentary on Titus* prol.). Perhaps the work entitled *On the Apostle* (Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* V.27) was an orthodox attempt to defend Paul and win him from the heretics (Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 149). The Scillitan martyrs definitely venerated Paul (G. Bonner, “The Scillitan Saints and the Pauline Epistles,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 7 (1956): 141–146). The *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 2.3 may quote 1 Corinthians 12:9 (Lindemann, *Paulus*, 188–189), or perhaps a common source (Massaux, *Influence*, 193); cf. M. L. Guillaumin, “En marge du ‘Martyre de Polycarpe’: Le discernement des allusions scripturaires,” in *Forma futuri* (Turin: Bottega d’Erasmus, 1975): 466–467. This present study bolsters the conclusions of Rensberger, “As the Apostle Teaches,” 107–120, though he adopts Harrison’s two-letter hypothesis, and thus dates *Phil* later.

<sup>45</sup> *New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1998), s.v., “Polycarp.”

<sup>46</sup> Lindemann, “Paul,” 45.

<sup>47</sup> One could also argue that when Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, and others supposedly “reappropriated” Paul, they did not handle him “as an alien with whom they were uncomfortable” (Balás, “Marcion Revisited,” 105).

## Paul and Philippians

Second, does Polycarp's *Phil* support the hypothesis of a conflated canonical Pauline Philippians? Many scholars have argued that the canonical Philippians is actually a composite of various letters.<sup>48</sup> For some, like Schmithals, this contention is part of a larger theory. Schmithals argues that a single individual collected/edited the Pauline letters to provide the Church with an anti-Gnostic arsenal. Schmithals believes that the Pauline texts were edited and merged to contain more explicit anti-Gnostic materials and to form seven letters (the symbol of completeness).<sup>49</sup>

Scholars who espouse a fragmented canonical Philippians point to the shift in tone and topic in Philippians 3:2, the inclusion of Paul's "travel plans" at the end of Philippians 2, the incongruity of a "thank-you note" placed at Philippians 4:10–20, the instant change in Epaphroditus' position between 2:25–30 and 4:18, and Paul's reference to "writing the same things" in 3:1.<sup>50</sup> As a result, various scholars have reconstructed three separate letters in Philippians: (1) Letter A, a "thank-you note" (*Dankschreiben*) which has been stripped of an opening and closing and has been placed in 4:10–20; (2) Letter B, found fairly intact in 1:1–3:1, 4:4–9, and 4:21–23. (3) Letter C, a *Kampfbrief*, which survives in 3:2–4:3 (or 3:2–4:1).

*Phil* 3 declares, "For neither I, nor any other like me, is able to follow the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who taught the word of truth accurately and firmly when he was among you, and who wrote letters to you when he was absent, which if you study you will be able to edify yourselves in the faith given you." This passage provides Polycarp's intriguing reference to *letters* (ἐπιστολάς) written to the Philippians by Paul. Sellew contends, "My point, in sum, is that when Polycarp stated that Paul wrote 'letters' to the Philippians, we must presume that the bishop means what he says and that he knows what he is saying."<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> See a list in P. Sellew, "Laodiceans and the Philippians Fragments Hypothesis," *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994): 17 n.1.

<sup>49</sup> W. Schmithals, "On the Composition and Earliest Collection of the Major Epistles of Paul," in *Paul and the Gnostics*, trans. J. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972), 239–274.

<sup>50</sup> Sellew, "Laodiceans," 17–19.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

Lightfoot gives some interpretive possibilities: (1) Polycarp does refer to more than one letter written to the Philippians, but all except our canonical letter have been lost. The Syriac *Catalogus Sinaiticus* (c. A.D. 400) lists a letter to the Philippians twice, but seemingly due to a textual error.<sup>52</sup> Georgius Syncellus (8th–9th century) referred to Paul's "first" letter to the Philippians.<sup>53</sup> (2) Polycarp meant only one letter although he used the plural ἐπιστολάς.<sup>54</sup> (3) Polycarp thought of 1 and 2 Thessalonians as addressed to the Philippians in a general way, since both Thessalonica and Philippi were in Macedonia.<sup>55</sup> (4) Polycarp refers to letters which have been merged in our present canonical Philippians.<sup>56</sup> (5) Polycarp merely deduced more than one letter from Philippians 3:1. (6) 2 Thessalonians originally was addressed to the Philippians, but was sent on as a circular letter to Thessalonica, during which process the greeting was changed in the text.<sup>57</sup> (7) The problem arises from an imprecision based upon Pauline phraseology. 2 Corinthians 10:1 also includes an antithesis between being present and absent (cf. Philippians 1:27); Pauline influence continues "through letters when absent" (2 Corinthians 10:11).<sup>58</sup> (8) Polycarp means that all of Paul's letters, regardless of their original addressees, would have edified all Christians everywhere, including the Philippians.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>52</sup> A. Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London: Duckworth, 1960), 209.

<sup>53</sup> Sellw, "Laodiceans," 25 n.24.

<sup>54</sup> Lightfoot summons Pseudo-Dionysius' reference to the "letters" of Polycarp and Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* VI.43.3 (Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, II.3, 327). He adds that Polycarp "may have assumed" that the Philippians possessed other Pauline letters (ibid., 327). Lightfoot even supposes that ἐπιστολάς in *Phil* 13.2 may refer to one letter (Ignatius, *Polycarp*) rather than two (*Smyrnaeans* and *Polycarp*), but this interpretation does not seem natural, as he himself notes (ibid, 348). In contemporary literature, "letters" seems to have been used as a true plural (W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, trans. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957), 300). Nevertheless, Camelot considers the translation of ἐπιστολάς as singular to be grammatically possible (Camelot, *Ignace d'Antioche*, 206 n.1).

<sup>55</sup> Zahn, *Introduction*, I, 536; cf. 2 Corinthians 8:1–2; cf. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, vol. 1, 164 n.2.

<sup>56</sup> Sellw, "Laodiceans," 23–27.

<sup>57</sup> E. Schweizer, "Der zweite Thessalonicherbrief ein Philipperbrief?" *Theologische Zeitschrift* 1 (1945): 90–105.

<sup>58</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 15. Paul repeatedly refers to being "absent in body but present in spirit" (2 Cor. 5:3; Col. 2:5; 1 Thess. 2:17).

<sup>59</sup> Lindemann, "Paul," 41–42; cf. Barnett's concession to Harnack on this point (Barnett, *Paul*, 174).

One might combine options (7) and (8). In regard to (8), the particularity of Paul's letters had always been a problem in the early church.<sup>60</sup> Tertullian wrote, "But the title is of no concern, since when the apostle wrote to some he wrote to all" (*Adversus Marcionem* V.17).<sup>61</sup> The Muratorian canon compares seven Pauline epistles to the letters in the Apocalypse: "The blessed apostle Paul himself, following the example of his predecessor John, wrote only to seven churches by name . . . For John also, although in the Apocalypse he wrote to seven churches, nevertheless speaks to all."<sup>62</sup> The general applicability of letters was not peculiar to the Pauline collection. In *Phil* 13.2, Polycarp refers to the Ignatian collection: "They are subjoined to this letter, and you will be able to benefit greatly from them. For they contain faith, patience, and all the edification which pertains to our Lord." All this was a small step from Paul himself, who wrote, "Everything written before our time was written for our instruction" (Romans 15:4).

Regarding (7), the form criticism I employed in chapter 7 revealed that Greco-Roman writers regularly contrasted personal conversation in one's presence with "letters" (plural) in one's absence. In this case, writing "letters" in one's absence becomes a way of referring to the phenomena of letter-writing, regardless of the number of pieces composed.

It should be further noted that *Phil* 11 declares, "But I have neither perceived nor heard anything of this kind among you, among whom the blessed Paul labored, who are in the beginning of his epistle (*qui estis in principio epistulae eius*)."<sup>63</sup> Here, in this awkward construction as it now stands, Polycarp refers to but one epistle. Something seems to have been altered in either the translation into Latin or in the transmission of the text. Holmes' helpful summary lists seven interpretive reconstructions and emendations of the text which have been proposed by various scholars<sup>63</sup>: (1) "who in the beginning (*of the Gospel*) were his letters (*of commendation*)" (Nolte, Lightfoot, Glimm; Nielsen could be

---

<sup>60</sup> N. A. Dahl, "The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church," in *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (Leiden: Brill, 1962), 261–271. If 2 Peter 3:15 alludes to 1 Timothy 1:15–16, a similar situation is at work. 2 Peter states, "So also our beloved brother Paul wrote to you . . ." (see Grant, *Formation*, 31).

<sup>61</sup> English translation in Evans, *Tertullian*, 613.

<sup>62</sup> English translation in Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 94.

<sup>63</sup> Holmes, "Note," 207.



added<sup>64</sup>; cf. 2 Corinthians 3:2); (2) “who are *mentioned* in the beginning of his epistle” (Kleist; Holmes places Schoedel here, but Schoedel seems to lean toward (4) below<sup>65</sup>); (3) “who were *praised* [*laudati*] in the beginning of his letter” (Smith, Bauer, Paulsen, Harnack, Lindemann, Schweizer<sup>66</sup>; Lake and Camelot could be added<sup>67</sup>); (4) “who are in the beginning his *church*” (Hilgenfeld <sup>68</sup>); (5) “who were in the beginning of the *gospel*” (Krüger; Schoedel; cf. *1 Clement* 47.1–3); (6) who were in the beginning of his *apostolate*” (Nestle, Zahn); (7) “who *testifies* in the beginning of his letter (Volkmar).” (8) Holmes adds his own eighth option: the corruption took place in the Greek before the Latin translation. Due to homoeoteleuton, τοῖς ἐπαινούμενοις ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς αὐτοῦ was read as τοῖς ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς αὐτοῦ.<sup>69</sup> It is important to note that all the solutions which refer to Pauline correspondence to Philippi (2, 3, 7, 8) interpret the Latin *epistulae* as a genitive singular, expressing Polycarp’s awareness of one Pauline letter to the Philippians.

Scholars have usually overlooked certain parallel phenomena: *1 Clement* 47:1 exhorts the Corinthians, “take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle.”<sup>70</sup> Based upon this counsel, no one has argued that Paul only wrote one letter to the Corinthian church.<sup>71</sup> We have two “undisputed” Pauline texts, as well as a third lost letter (see 1 Corinthians 5:9).<sup>72</sup> Similarly, Ignatius’ *Ephesians* 12.2 states that

---

<sup>64</sup> Nielsen, “Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures,” 213.

<sup>65</sup> Schoedel, *Polycarp*, 34.

<sup>66</sup> Schweizer maintained that 2 Thessalonians was originally written to the Philippians, and the Philippians would have been praised in the beginning of this letter (2 Thessalonians 1:4).

<sup>67</sup> Lake, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 1, 297; Camelot, *Ignace d’Antioche*, 218 n.2.

<sup>68</sup> Hilgenfeld found one manuscript to support this reading. Codex Reginensis has *ecclesiae*, which he emended to *ecclesia*. He then transposed the sentence back into Greek as οἱ τινες ἐστε ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐκκλησία αὐτοῦ (A. Hilgenfeld, *Ignatii Antiocheni et Polycarpi Smyrnaei epistulae et martyria* (Berlin: Schwetschke, 1902), 326). Holmes notes the awkwardness of the present tense in such a reconstruction (Holmes, “Note,” 209 n.7).

<sup>69</sup> Holmes, “Note,” 208.

<sup>70</sup> Because the context of *1 Clement* refers to schismatic parties, Clement’s reference to “the” epistle would naturally imply 1 Corinthians (Lindemann, “Paul,” 32).

<sup>71</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 83.

<sup>72</sup> Some scholars further split 2 Corinthians into a various assortment of original letters. Naturally, others argue for the unity of the work.

Paul “in every Epistle makes mention of you in Christ Jesus.”<sup>73</sup> Here, all of Paul’s letters are seen as related to the Ephesians. As Lindemann cautions, “But it should be obvious that Ignatius’ point is not to give precise information on the frequency of the word *Ephesus* in the Pauline corpus. Ignatius is simply trying to link the Apostle Paul and the Church of Ephesus as intimately as possible.”<sup>74</sup> Again, in *Phil* 11.3, Polycarp writes, “For concerning you he <Paul> boasts in all the Churches who then alone had known the Lord, for we had not yet known him.” In actuality, Paul only mentions the Philippians in 1 Thessalonians 2:2, and even then not as a boast. Lindemann warns that this “error” “should not be interpreted too literally.”<sup>75</sup> In the same way, the statement from Polycarp’s *Phil* 3 should not be forced into carrying more weight than it is able to bear. Theoretical edifices should not be built upon the sands of rhetorical flourishes.

Sellew has argued that the external evidence of the pseudepigraphal *Epistle to the Laodiceans* (which survives in Latin translation) should also be marshalled. He claims that *Laodiceans*, whose structure is dependent on the canonical Philippians and whose repeated quotations from Philippians come in exact sequence, does not quote from the *Dankschreiben* (4:10–20) or the *Kampfbrief* (3:2–4:1). However, *Laodiceans* 13 states “look (*praecavete*) out for the dogs,” seemingly an allusion to Philippians 3:2. Sellew argues that since the word *praecavete* differs from the Vulgate rendition of Philippians 3:2 (*videte*), this is not an allusion. However, one recalls that all the quotations come in sequential order, and *Laodiceans* 13 falls in place where a quote from Philippians 3 would

---

<sup>73</sup> For a summary of older interpretations of this passage, see Harrison, *Polycarp’s Two Epistles*, 247–251. Harrison himself decides that the text infers that Ignatius only possessed Ephesians, 1 Corinthians, Pauline notes later incorporated in the 1 and 2 Timothy, and Romans with the supposed Ephesian cover letter in chapter 16 (*ibid.*, 250). All of Ignatius’ Pauline collection, then, would refer to the Ephesians. Grant and Goodspeed use this as possible evidence that the Pauline corpus was collected at Ephesus. See Grant and Goodspeed, *History*, 18; cf. Goodspeed, *Formation*, 29: “Certainly almost everything points to Ephesus as the place of origin of the collection”; cf. Streeter, *Primitive Church*, 160; E. E. Lemcio, “Ephesus and the New Testament Canon,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 69 (1986): 210–234. Harnack opted for Corinth (Harnack, *Die Briefsammlung*, I.4.8ff). Ephesus may in fact have been the location, but Ignatius is simply a witness of the attempt to generalize the audience of Paul’s letters.

<sup>74</sup> Lindemann, “Paul,” 36.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

be. This fact alone gives greater weight to the supposition that *Laodiceans* 13 does in fact quote Philippians 3:2, although the Latin translator of *Laodiceans* chose a different Latin equivalent for the Greek βλέπετε than the Vulgate did later. Therefore, *Laodiceans* does quote from the so-called *Kampfbrief*. Furthermore, *Laodiceans* does not quote Philippians 1:1, 4–11, 14–17; 2:1, 3–11, 15–30; or 4:7. Just as the letter opening and the “Christ hymn” did not serve the Laodicean compiler, the so-called “thank you note” and (most of the) polemical *Kampfbrief* material may not have been useful either. In the final analysis, any compositional theory of canonical Philippians should be based on internal evidence from the argument and structure of Philippians rather than on the highly uncertain external evidence in *Phil* or *Laodiceans*.<sup>76</sup>

### Polycarp and the Pastorals

Third, my examination explains the relative abundance of allusions to the Pastoral Letters. It has seemed unusual to many scholars that Polycarp’s letter to the Philippians should contain the first certain use of 1 Timothy, and then with sudden abundance.<sup>77</sup> Campenhausen wrote a largely ignored work that discusses the many similarities between *Phil* and the canonical Pastorals. These similarities include the spirit and construction of the letters, respect for tradition, anti-Docetism/Gnosticism,<sup>78</sup> concern for the poor, strong morality, understanding of church offices, and opposition of the “ecclesiastical” Paul to a schismatic understanding of Paul. Both the Pastorals and Polycarp lack an eschatological motivation for the Christian ethical behavior which they stress.<sup>79</sup> Within early Christian literature, the term ματαιολογία only occurs in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 1:6; cf. Tit. 1:10) and Polycarp (*Phil* 2.1); the verbs προάγειν and ἐπακολουθεῖν are only found together in the Pastorals (1 Tim. 5:24) and Polycarp (*Phil* 3.3). *Phil* 5.2 contains a cluster of words only found elsewhere in the Pastorals: ἐν τῷ

---

<sup>76</sup> Personally, I would side with the recent studies which have demonstrated the letter’s integrity through rhetorical and structural studies. For a partial list, see Sellew, “*Laodiceans*,” 19 n.4.

<sup>77</sup> Naturally, the late *Life of Polycarp* found nothing strange about Polycarp knowing and using the Pastorals (*Life* 22).

<sup>78</sup> For Campenhausen, both works criticized Marcion.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 302. See Bovon-Thurneysen, “Ethik.”

νῦν αἰῶνι (1 Tim. 6:17; cf. 2 Tim. 4:10);<sup>80</sup> διάβολος (as an adjective); δῖλος; ἐγκρατής.<sup>81</sup>

Based upon these similarities, Campenhausen contended that Polycarp actually wrote the Pastorals,<sup>82</sup> or that Polycarp perhaps had commissioned someone in his circle to draft the letters. Campenhausen argued that any relatively superficial differences could be explained by the dissimilarities in purpose. Koester argues that Campenhausen has “many convincing arguments,” and should not be summarily dismissed.<sup>83</sup> Koester adds,

The author <of the Pastorals> was, no doubt, an influential and farseeing leader of the church who pointed the way toward the consolidation of Christianity as a well organized religion acceptable to the culture of its time, and strengthened its defense against the false teachers, especially the gnostics, whose propaganda sought to turn Christianity away from the world and from the moral obligations of society. From the first half of II CE, only one such church leader is known by name: Polycarp of Smyrna.<sup>84</sup>

However, his theory does not seem compelling. Schoedel has argued that it fails to account for the absence in *Phil* of christological terms important in the Pastorals (e.g., ἐπιφάνεια, σωτήρ),<sup>85</sup> and Rensberger points to the similar absence of πιστός ὁ λόγος to signal familiar formulations.<sup>86</sup> I would append other Pastoral terms such as εὐσέβεια/εὐσεβῶς, διδασκαλία, and φιλανθρωπία.<sup>87</sup> I would further add that certain shorter words which are frequent in the “uncontested” Pauline epistles and absent in the Pastorals are also present in *Phil*. These include ἄν (3x), διό (3x), εἴτε (3x), and σύν (1x).<sup>88</sup>

A few other observations are worth mentioning. First, Meinhold wonders why, if one accepts Campenhausen’s theory, the early ecclesiastical tradition would

---

<sup>80</sup> Bauer stresses the alternative use of ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος or ἐνεστώτης elsewhere in early Christian literature (Matt. 12:32; Luke 20:34; Rom. 12:2; Gal. 1:4) (Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 27).

<sup>81</sup> Campenhausen, *Polykarp von Smyrna*, 25–26.

<sup>82</sup> Hoffmann followed this theory (Hoffmann, *Marcion*, 284). Earlier, Völter had argued that the Ignatian interpolator/editor had written the Pastorals (Völter, *Polykarp und Ignatius*, 104ff).

<sup>83</sup> Koester, *Introduction*, 305; cf. J. C. Beker, “Pastoral Letters, The,” in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962).

<sup>84</sup> Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 305.

<sup>85</sup> Schoedel, *Polykarp*, 5.

<sup>86</sup> Rensberger, “As the Apostle Teaches,” 122.

<sup>87</sup> 1 Timothy 1:10; 2:2, 12; 4:6–8; 6:3, 5–6, 11; 2 Timothy 3:5; 4:3; Titus 1:1, 9; 2:1; 3:4.

<sup>88</sup> Thompson and Baird’s recent concordance of *Phil* is a helpful tool in such studies (Thompson and Baird, *Critical Concordance*, 1996).

have completely forgotten the role of Polycarp (who was an authoritative figure in his own right) in the drafting of the Pastorals.<sup>89</sup> Second, if Polycarp wrote the Pastorals, we would expect that their deviations from the “uncontested” Pauline epistles would also (unconsciously) be present in *Phil*, especially in the formulaic portions of the letter openings and closings. But our epistolary study of *Phil* has demonstrated that this is not the case. Third, the background of *Phil* helps explain the many allusions to the Pastorals. Polycarp was looking for further instructions among his collected authoritative texts which would fit this specific situation. Within one letter, 1 Timothy discusses the proper characteristics of church leaders (1 Tim. 3:1–13), the process of bringing a charge against an elder (5:17–22), and the statement that φιλαργυρία is the root of all evil (6:10). Due to Valens’ problem, Polycarp must have studied 1 Timothy repeatedly before writing to the Philippians. Fourth, if Polycarp’s method of appealing to authority was pseudonymity rather than citation, why did he not use this method with the Philippians, who highly revered Paul?<sup>90</sup> Fifth, *Phil* repeatedly quotes and alludes to the Pauline epistles (as well as other early Christian materials). This tendency of weaving traditional materials is absent from the Pastorals, as is the formulaic introduction εἰδοτέος ὅτι.<sup>91</sup> If Polycarp wrote the Pastoral epistles, one would expect the product to look more like *Phil* in this regard.<sup>92</sup> Sixth, Grant states, “. . . but Polycarp insists on the inferiority of himself to Paul and on the difference between the apostolic age and his own time (3:2); this insistence seems to exclude the possibility that he wrote letters in Paul’s name.”<sup>93</sup>

Furthermore, *Phil* 4 warrants special examination. *Phil* 4.1–6.1 provides a mixture of “Haustafel,” “Gemeinderegel” and “Tugend und Lasterkatalog” similar to the Pastoral Epistles, but seemingly not composed of verbal quotations.<sup>94</sup> Yet

---

<sup>89</sup> Meinhold, “Polykarpos,” 1692. An answer might be that Polycarp initially and continually hid the true origin of the Pastorals. A further inquiry would follow, concerning the character of Polycarp, who clearly understood the gap between himself and the apostles (Grant, *Formation*, 104).

<sup>90</sup> Lindemann has contrasted the methods of alleged early Christian pseudonymous writers and the Apostolic Fathers’ explicit use of Paul (Lindemann, “Paul,” 26).

<sup>91</sup> Rensberger, “As the Apostle Teaches,” 122. The closest parallel would be the οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι of 1 Timothy 1:8.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. the pseudonymous pastiche in *Laodiceans*.

<sup>93</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 104.

<sup>94</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 281–282.

attention must be given to Polycarp's peculiar use of the expression "knowing therefore that . . ." (*Phil* 1, 4, 5, and 6). Polycarp regularly uses this idiom as an introduction to a quotation from accepted tradition.<sup>95</sup> In *Phil* 4.1, Polycarp introduces a quote from 1 Timothy 6:7 with this "formulaic introduction": "*Knowing therefore that* we brought nothing into the world neither can we carry anything out." An allusion to 1 Timothy 6:10 immediately precedes this sentence in *Phil* 4.1. This "density" would seem to point to Polycarp's knowledge of 1 Timothy, contra Koester, who does not detect any such "density."<sup>96</sup> Rensberger notes that the combination of proverbial material in 1 Timothy 6:7 and 10 appears to be original and independent of any source, while the combination in *Phil* 4 appears to be dependent (presumably on 1 Timothy).<sup>97</sup>

As a final note, J. B. Bauer has theorized that the writer of the Pastorals used *Phil* as a model or was dependent upon it in some way.<sup>98</sup> But if *Phil* incorporates the Pastorals (as I have argued), then the Pastorals could not contrarily be contingent upon *Phil*.

### Polycarp and "Righteousness"

Fourth, others have claimed that the reference to "righteousness" in *Phil* 3.1 refers to a theological controversy in Philippi: certain Pauline parties were causing problems because of their rendition of a righteousness by faith.<sup>99</sup> But this examination has revealed that Polycarp is not using "righteousness" in a theological debate against Gnostic heresies, nor in a theological debate about justification by faith vs. justification by works.

Chapter 3 states,

These things, brethren, I write to you concerning righteousness, not at my own instance, but because you first invited me. For neither am I, nor is any other like me, able to follow the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who when he was among you in the presence of the men of that time taught accurately and stedfastly the word of truth, and also when he was

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 280.

<sup>96</sup> Koester, *Introduction*, vol. 2, 307.

<sup>97</sup> Rensberger, "As the Apostle Teaches," 125.

<sup>98</sup> Bauer, *Die Polykarpbriefe*, 27–28.

<sup>99</sup> Meinhold, "Polykarpos."

absent wrote letters to you, from the study of which you will be able to build yourselves up into the faith given you; which is the mother of us all when faith follows, and love of God and Christ and neighbour goes before. For if one be in this company he has fulfilled the command of righteousness, for he who has love is far from all sin.

The word “righteousness” appears twice in this short chapter, and Polycarp explicitly mentions that the Philippians had written to him for advice concerning “righteousness.” My interpretation reveals that the issue was the ethically righteous response to a specific situation (see my chapter 9). The second instance of “righteousness” in this chapter is explicitly found within the context of fulfilling the “*command* of righteousness.” Lindemann agrees that “righteousness” for Polycarp is chiefly used in an ethical or moral sense, with the exception of 8.1, where Christ Jesus is the “earnest of our righteousness.”<sup>100</sup> Dehandschutter concludes that *Phil*’s “righteousness” resembles the concept in Matthew and *1 Clement*.<sup>101</sup> In this way, Lindemann’s comments about *1 Clement*’s use of Pauline tradition holds true for Polycarp as well. Both letters demonstrate “very little about the strength of Pauline *theology*” in the second century, but they do show that Paul “carried great weight” “as an apostle and as a teacher of the church in the context of actual conflicts of *ecclesiology*.”<sup>102</sup>

### Polycarp and the Pauline Collection

Fifth, did Polycarp play a role in the formation of a Pauline collection? I have argued that *Phil* demonstrates a reasonably certain incorporation of Romans, 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and 1 Timothy (and perhaps 2 Corinthians, 2 Thessalonians, and 2 Timothy as well). This evidence seems to imply that a seminal Pauline collection was being put together in Asia Minor by the beginning of the second century.<sup>103</sup> Just as Polycarp had collected the Ignatian

---

<sup>100</sup> “In this case, at least, Polycarp obviously has in mind the eschatological sense of righteousness as the goal of our salvation.” (Lindemann, “Paul,” 44).

<sup>101</sup> Dehandschutter, “Polycarp’s Epistle,” 291.

<sup>102</sup> Lindemann, “Paul,” 35–36.

<sup>103</sup> Rensberger, “As the Apostle Teaches,” 119. Goodspeed believes he can place the formation of the collection with “great definiteness” between the writing of Acts and Revelation (Goodspeed, *Formation*, 22–23). But his theories of the publication of Acts serving as the impetus of a Pauline corpus and of the seven letters in Revelation 1–4 evidencing the corpus have both been challenged.

material, he may have had a hand in the Pauline collection. Snyder infers from *Phil* 3.2 that Polycarp knew a collection of Pauline letters.<sup>104</sup> He further maintains that the Pauline collection seems to have been first collected and published at Ephesus.<sup>105</sup> Grant states that Polycarp “certainly” knew a Pauline corpus.<sup>106</sup> Polycarp refers to the “word of truth” taught in Paul’s letters, and explains this “word of truth” by allusions to Galatians 4:26 and Romans 13:8 (*Phil* 3.2–3).<sup>107</sup> As I have argued, Polycarp certainly alludes to six Pauline epistles, and perhaps nine in all. If this is the case, then W. Bauer’s theory that Marcion was the first systematic collector of the Pauline letters must be abandoned.<sup>108</sup> Instead, according to Gamble, “Marcion probably took over an existing edition of the collection without altering even its arrangement.”<sup>109</sup>

But *Phil* brings up a further interesting detail: Polycarp appears to use at least some of the Pastoral Epistles (certainly 1 Timothy and probably 2 Timothy). If so, he undoubtedly accepted a Pauline authorship.<sup>110</sup> It would seem, then, that Polycarp’s Pauline collection would have also included at least some of the

---

The *Muratorian Canon*, obviously in error, states that Paul copied the Apocalypse! Schmithals also tried to date the collection with preciseness (W. Schmithals, “Zur Abfassung und ältesten Sammlung der paulinischen Hauptbriefe,” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und der Kunde Älteren Kirche* 51 (1960): 225–245). N. A. Dahl replied in “Welche Ordnung der Paulusbriefe wird vom muratorischen Kanon vorausgesetzt?” *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 52 (1961): 50.

<sup>104</sup> G. F. Snyder, “Polycarp,” in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. E. Ferguson (New York: Garland, 1990); Goodspeed and Grant, *History*, 18. See also Ignatius, *Ephesians* 12.2.

<sup>105</sup> Barnard, “Problem,” 31; he refers to Ignatius, *Romans* 4.3, but this passage does not seem applicable. See the discussion above.

<sup>106</sup> Grant, *Formation*, 102.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 103. Grant’s further contention that the phrase “word of truth” comes from 2 Timothy 2:15, 18 may be the case, but the dependency of such a small, common phrase would be impossible to prove; I therefore consider the literary dependency doubtful.

<sup>108</sup> Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, 221–222.

<sup>109</sup> Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 41. The impetus to collect the Pauline letters came early. Small collections may even have begun with Paul’s referrals of one church to another (1 Cor. 16:1; 2 Cor. 8:1; cf. Col. 4:15–16; see Grant, *Formation*, 27).

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Lindemann, “Paul,” 44. Berding stresses the presence of Pastoral references in the three clusters of Pauline citations in *Phil* gathered around explicit references to the Apostle Paul (3.2–4.1, 9.1–10.1, 11.2–12.1) (Berding, “Polycarp of Smyrna’s View”). One notices, however, the presence of non-Pauline material in the second cluster (*1 Clement* and *1 Peter* in *Phil* 9.1–10.1).



Pastoral Epistles.<sup>111</sup> Therefore, scholars must be more guarded in their assessments of the status of the Pastoral Epistles in the second century. Consider Gamble's statements, for example:

One traditional component of the Pauline collection was not regularly present in its early editions: namely, the pseudonymous letters to Timothy and Titus. . . . They formed no part of Marcion's edition, doubtless because Marcion did not know them and not, as Tertullian alleged (*Against Marcion* 5.21),<sup>112</sup> because he rejected them. . . . Hesitancy about the authority of these letters is understandable: since they were addressed to individuals, their relevance to the whole church was even harder to perceive than that of Paul's letters to particular churches.<sup>113</sup>

The view that the Pastorals were placed into the Pauline collection at a later date in order to rebuff Marcion must also be abandoned.<sup>114</sup> Nor may we say, in the case of Smyrna, that the Pastorals were added to the Pauline collection in the mid-

---

<sup>111</sup> Harrison recognized this (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 295), but combined it with his c. 135 dating of *Phil* 1–12. For older proposals of both a unified *Phil* and a Polycarpian collection which included the Pastorals, see Orr, *Progress*, 65; and Duchesne, *Early History*, vol. 1, 98.

<sup>112</sup> One can say for sure that Gnostics "almost invariably rejected the Pastoral Epistles, since in them something much like Gnosticism was being attacked" (Grant, *Formation*, 181).

<sup>113</sup> Gamble, *New Testament Canon*, 42–43. The relationship between Marcionites and the Pastorals is sketchy. Philastrius' testimony that Marcion accepted *only* the Pastoral Epistles is clearly mistaken (Blackman, *Marcion*, 2 n. 3). Marcion's disciples did accept the Pastorals (ibid., 48). Chrysostom states that Marcionites used 2 Timothy 1:18 as proof of their ditheism (ibid., 53 n. 2). The so-called "Marcionite Prologues" include introductions to the Pastorals, but the origin of these three prologues is uncertain (ibid., 52–53). The reference in the prologue to Titus, "*de haereticis vitandis qui in scripturis iudaicis credunt*," may argue for a Marcionite origin (cf. Titus 1:14: "Jewish fables"). For an introduction to the debate, see N. A. Dahl, "Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters," *Semeia* 12 (1978): 233–277.

<sup>114</sup> Knox, *Marcion*, 73–76; Obviously, Campenhausen's view that the Pastorals were *written* after Marcion should also be disposed (Campenhausen, *Formation*, 143; cf. 212). Cf. the views of Quispel, similarly in need of revision in regard to the Pastorals: Quispel, "Marcion," 357–358.

second century.<sup>115</sup> Naturally, various geographical regions developed at different paces; perhaps Smyrna was far ahead of other locations.<sup>116</sup>

Finally, because Polycarp seems to have possessed a Pauline collection, but not the four-fold Gospel,<sup>117</sup> *Phil* may act as evidence that the Pauline corpus was the first part of the New Testament collected.<sup>118</sup> One might expect such a natural compilation as various Pauline churches communicated with one another.

---

<sup>115</sup> Contra Goodspeed, *Formation*, 27. This relates to Goodspeed's overall reconstruction of a seven letter collection, then ten, and then thirteen (*ibid.*, 30). By 1926, Harnack asserted that the Pastorals were added to the Pauline collection by "about the year 100" (Harnack, *Die Briefsammlung*, 6, 14f). Harrison labeled Harnack's theory "out of the question" (Harrison, *Polycarp's Two Epistles*, 238).

<sup>116</sup> For example, theoretically, the Pauline collection in Smyrna could have been at a different stage than that at Rome.

<sup>117</sup> Barnard contends that Polycarp had access to a Pauline collection, but his writing was prior to the collection of the four-fold Gospel (Barnard, "Problem," 36).

<sup>118</sup> Nielsen, "Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures," 210.

## Conclusion

This study has traversed from the preliminary investigations of occasion, rhetoric, theme, and unity, to arrive at the following conclusions: First, although Polycarp's weaving of sources has been described as "unoriginal," he was in fact a creative thinker. Second, his apparent disregard for the Hebrew Scriptures fits his background and purpose. Third, Polycarp did not have Marcionite tendencies. Fourth, the evidence for Polycarp labeling Ephesians as "Scripture" is credible. Fifth, Polycarp is an important witness to the collection and authoritative use of New Testament documents, as well as *1 Clement* and Ignatius' epistles, though not of canonization in the fixed, normative sense. Sixth, Polycarp's epistle proves that Paul's theological legacy was not forgotten by the "catholic" church. Furthermore, *Phil*'s use of the Pastoral Epistles and apparent use of Acts prove that these works were not written later to "reclaim" Paul from heretical monopoly. Seventh, Polycarp's letter cannot be used to support the hypothesis of a conflated canonical Philippians. Eighth, Polycarp did not write the Pastoral Epistles. Rather, *Phil* provides an external *terminus ante quem* for the Pastorals (certainly 1 Timothy and probably 2 Timothy). Ninth, Polycarp's reference to the theme of "righteousness" does not reveal a disagreement over Pauline theology in the Philippian community. Tenth, Polycarp reveals a fairly developed Pauline collection in the early second century. Interestingly, Polycarp's collection seems to have included Pastoral Epistles (or at least 1 Timothy and probably 2 Timothy). Polycarp's *Phil* is thus a valuable and early witness to the availability and function of the New Testament documents in the early Church.

An important part of this investigation has been the integration of new insights from background analysis, epistolary criticism, form criticism, and rhetorical criticism with these considerations of Polycarp's use of the New Testament writings. The ensuing applications are some examples (the numbers in parenthesis refer to a correspondence with the ten issues listed above): (1) I have demonstrated Polycarp's creative weaving of traditional materials through his rhetorical strategies, the ordering of his *Haustafeln/Gemeindetafeln*, the repetitive

inclusion of avarice, and his transformation of traditional material. The contrast between originality and transmitting tradition is a false dichotomy. (2) The Jewish-Christian tension in Smyrna and the Gentile audience in Philippi may have affected Polycarp's limited use of the Hebrew Scriptures. (3) The impetus in Polycarp's choice of texts is not quasi-Marcionite theology, but paraenetic purpose. (4) Although some have argued that Polycarp's deprecation of his scriptural knowledge in *Phil* 12.1 could not refer to New Testament works, since he obviously knows them well, such a common rhetorical disavowal should not be taken too literally. In fact, the intertextual use of the verb ἐγκύπτω in 3.2 (which *1 Clement* consistently uses of the Hebrew Scriptures) may reveal Polycarp's elevation of New Testament documents. (5) Situations like that which Polycarp faced (the fall of a church elder in a predominantly Gentile congregation) may have compelled the early Church to use Christian texts in authoritative ways. (7) The ancient correlation between conversation in one's presence and writing letters in one's absence warns against taking the plural "letters" in 3.2 too rigidly. (8) Epistolary criticism, especially in regard to the formalized letter openings and closings, argues against Polycarpian authorship of the Pastorals. *Phil* also differs from the Pastorals in its constant weaving of traditional materials. Although the sudden, repeated use of 1 Timothy may seem surprising at first glance, this source served Polycarp in multiple ways, since it discusses the proper characteristics of church leaders, the process of bringing a charge against an elder, and strong condemnations of covetousness. (9) A close examination of the paraenetic use of the theme of "righteousness" reveals that the term is being used in a moral, not a theological, sense.

This study has also included new insights into the questions of *Phil*'s relationship to Marcion, the unity and integrity of the epistle, and the nature of its incorporation of authoritative texts. I have argued that little historical weight should be placed upon Irenaeus' anecdote about Polycarp and Marcion: on a form critical level, the pericope is a chreia which has lost any sense of context; the connection with Marcion may have developed from a later anti-Marcionite application of *Phil*; and the contextual association with a doubtful Johannine chreia argues against historicity. A simple coordination of the Irenaeus anecdote with *Phil* 7 in order to argue for a specifically anti-Marcion intention of the latter should be avoided. *Phil* 7 evidences a generic use of Johannine-like anti-heretical traditions.

This investigation has also added new arguments for the unity of *Phil*, and thus an early date of c. A.D. 115 for the entire epistle. Schoedel drew attention to Polycarp's awkward transformation of the standardized letter opening as an explanation of the grammatical difficulty in *Phil* 1; I have provided confirmation by pointing to a similar transformation of the letter closing due to the same cause, the Ignatian journey. My examination also supports the contention that *Phil* 9 does not place equal certainty upon the deaths of Ignatius and his companions and the deaths of Paul and the other apostles. Form criticism of *paradeigmata* reveals that they usually included the rewards of the example's faithfulness; therefore, Polycarp felt obliged to refer to Ignatius' heavenly recompense. Epistolary criticism strongly contests Harrison's theory of the accidental merging of two Polycarpian letters. The conventional nature of the letter closing also explains the paucity of allusions in *Phil* 13 and 14, which Harrison contrasted with the rest of the epistle. In addition, one of the major topics in the body of the epistle (ὑπομονή) is also found in chapter 13. Finally, I have brought forward *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 20 as an example of a request for further details about a martyrdom from those geographically closer to the events.

This study has gone beyond merely counting Polycarp's quotations and has examined the nature of his allusions. The stringing together often appears to be topical. He often transforms the meaning of the original texts, and intertextual echoes sometimes bring a richer significance to the allusions. I have shown that Polycarp's culling of authoritative texts was based upon a paraenetic motivation; this stands as a warning against the simplistic equating of the works Polycarp used with the works he possessed.

If one accepts my arguments for *Phil*'s unity and my demonstrations of *Phil*'s incorporation of New Testament documents, then Polycarp's letter becomes the first reasonable evidence for the use of 1 Peter, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, 1 John, and perhaps Acts. All theories which place the composition of these texts later than c. A.D. 115 must be discarded, based purely upon external evidence.

Finally, I have shared a few other minor observations which are not directly related to the issue of Polycarp's incorporation of the New Testament, but are worthy of mention. These include the dating of Polycarp's martyrdom, the previous relationship between Polycarp and the Philippians, the association of "righteousness" with three interwoven topics, and the nature of the connection between heresy and avarice.

In summary, the foundational studies of the occasion, epistolary nature, rhetorical devices and theme of *Phil*, when combined with further argumentation for its unified dating, have prepared the way for new insights into early second-century Christianity. More specifically, although Polycarp simply meant to assist a sister church in time of predicament, his extant letter broadens our understanding of the availability and use of New Testament documents early in this pivotal period.



## Bibliography

- Abrahams, Israel: *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924.
- Aichele, G. and G. A. Phillips: "Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis." *Semeia* 69/70 (1995): 7–18.
- Aland, B.: "Marcion–Marcionites–Marcionism." In *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, ed. by Angelo Di Berardino. Translated by Adrian Walford. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- : "Marcion: Versuch einer neuen Interpretation." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70 (1973): 420–447.
- Altaner, Berthold: *Patrology*. 2nd ed. Translated by H. C. Graef. New York: Herder and Herder, 1961.
- Andrews, Herbert Thomas: "Polycarp." In *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.
- Aune, David E.: *Revelation 1–5*. Word Biblical Commentary, 52A. Dallas: Word Books, 1997.
- Ayer, Joseph Cullen: *A Source Book for Ancient Church History: From the Apostolic Age to the Close of the Conciliar Period*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.
- Baden, H.: "Das Polykarpmartorium." *Pastor Bonus* 24 (1911/1912): 705–713; 24 (1912/1913): 71–81, 136–151.
- Balás, David L.: "Marcion Revisited: A 'Post-Harnack' Perspective." In *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers*. Edited by W. Eugene March, 95–108. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1980.
- Balch, D.: *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Bardenhewer, O.: *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*. Freiburg: Herder, 1902.
- Bardy, G.: *Eusèbe de Césarée: Histoire Ecclésiastique*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1960.
- Barnard, L. W.: "The Background of St. Ignatius of Antioch," *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963): 193–206.
- : "In Defence of Pseudo-Pionius' Account of Saint Polycarp's Martyrdom." In *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*. Edited by P. Granfield and J. A. Jungmann. Vol. 1, 192–204. Münster: Aschendorff, 1970.
- : "The Problem of St. Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians." Chap. in *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background*. New York: Schocken Books, 1966.
- Barnes, Timothy D.: "A Note on Polycarp." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 18 (1967): 433–437.
- : "Pre-Decian Acta Martyrum." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 19 (1968): 509–531.



- Barnett, Albert Edward: *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Barnikol, E.: *Die Entstehung der Kirche im zweiten Jahrhundert und die Zeit Marcions*. 2nd ed. Kiel: W. G. Mührlau, 1933.
- : *Philipp 2: Der Marcionitische Ursprung des Mythos-Satzes Phil. 2,6–7*. 1.–3. Aufl. Forschungen zur Entstehung des Urchristentums des Neuen Testaments und der Kirche, 7. Kiel: W. G. Mührlau, 1932.
- Baronius, Cesare: *Annales Ecclesiastici*. Coloniae Agrippinae: Ioannis Gymnaci, 1588.
- Barrett, C.K.: *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.
- : “Pauline Controversies in the Post-Pauline Period.” *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 229–245.
- Batiffol, P.: *Anciennes littératures chrétiennes*. Vol. 1: *La littérature grecque*. 4th ed. Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1901.
- : *L'église naissante et le Catholicisme*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1909.
- : “Ignatius.” In *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, ed. James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- : “Polycarp.” In *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, ed. James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- Bauckham, R.: “Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel.” *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 44 (1993): 24–69.
- Bauer, Johannes Bapt.: *Die Polykarpbriefe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.
- Bauer, Walter: *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament: Die Apostolischen Väter, vol. 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920.
- : *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by W. F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- : *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. 2nd ed. Translated by the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins and edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Baumeister, T.: *Die Anfänge der Theologie des Martyriums*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1980.
- Baur, F. B.: *Die Ignatianischen Briefe und ihr neuester Kritiker: Eine Streitschrift gegen Herrn Bunsen*. Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1848.
- Beker, J. Christiaan: “Echoes and Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul's Theology.” In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 64–69. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series*, 83. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- : “Pastoral Letters, The.” In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- Berding, Kenneth: “Polycarp of Smyrna's View of the Authorship of 1 and 2 Timothy.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 (1999): 349–360.
- Best, E.: “Bishop and Deacons: Philippians 1,1.” *Studia Evangelica* 4 (1968): 371–376.

- Bihlmeyer, Karl: *Die Apostolischen Väter*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1956.
- Blackman, E. C.: *Marcion and His Influence*. London: S.P.C.K., 1948.
- Blondell, D.: *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi de episcopis et presbyteris*. Amsterdam: Ioannem Blaev, 1646.
- Blum, Georg Günter: *Tradition und Sukzession: Studien zum Normbegriff des Apostolischen von Paulus bis Irenaeus*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums, 9. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1963.
- Boismard, M. E. *Le martyre de Jean l'apôtre*. Cahiers de la Revue biblique, 35. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1996.
- Bonner, G. "The Scillitan Saints and the Pauline Epistles." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 7 (1956): 141–146.
- Bormann, Lukas: *Philippi: Stadt und Christengemeinde zur Zeit des Paulus*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 78. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Bovon-Thurneysen, Annegreth: "Ethik und Eschatologie im Philipperbrief des Polycarp von Smyrna." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 29 (1973): 241–256.
- Bowersock, Glen Warren: *Martyrdom and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Bowker, J.: *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Branscomb, Harvie: "Second Century Christianity Re-Examined." *Christendom* 8 (1943): 408–410.
- Braun, Françoise-Marie: *Jean le théologien et son Évangile dans l'église ancienne*. Etudes bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1959.
- Bremmer, J. N.: "Some Observations on the Martyria of Polycarp and Pionius." *Vigiliae Christianae* 39 (1985): 110–130.
- Brind'Amour, Pierre: "La date du martyre de Saint Polycarpe (le 23 février 167)." *Analecta Bollandiana* 98 (1980): 456–462.
- Brisbee, Gary A. *Pre-Decian Acts of Martyrs and Commentarii*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Brown, Raymond E.: *The Epistles of John*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday, 1982.
- Burgess, Theodore C.: *Epideictic Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902.
- Burton, Edward: Introduction to *The Apostolic Fathers: The Epistles of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp*. By William Wake. Edinburgh: John Grant, 1909.
- Buschmann, Gerd: *Das Martyrium des Polykarp*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- : "Martyrium Polycarpi 4 und der Montanismus." *Vigiliae Christianae* 49 (1995): 105–145.
- Cacitti, R.: *Grande Sabato. Il contesto pasquale quattordicesimano nella formazione della teologia del martirio*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1994.
- Cadoux, Cecil John: *Ancient Smyrna: A History of the City from the Earliest Times to 324 A.D.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938.
- : Review of *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*, by P. N. Harrison. In *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1937): 267–270.

- : "A Tentative Synthetic Chronology of the Apostolic Age." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 56 (1937): 177–191.
- Camelot, P. Th.: *Ignace d'Antioche, Polycarpe de Smyrne, Lettres, Martyre de Polycarpe*. 2nd ed. Sources chrétiennes, 10. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1951.
- Campanhausen, Hans F. von: *Bearbeitungen und Interpolationen des Polykarp Martyriums*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse; 1957, 3. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1957.
- : *The Formation of the Christian Bible*. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- : *Die Idee des Martyrium in der alten Kirche*. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- : "Ostertermin oder Osterfasten? Zum Verständnis des Irenäusbriefes an Viktor (Euseb. Hist. eccl. 5,24,12–17)." *Vigiliae Christianae* 28 (1974): 114–138.
- : *Polykarp von Smyrna und die Pastoralbriefe*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse; 1951, 2. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1951.
- Centuriatores Magdeburgensis: *Ecclesiastica Historia*. Basel, 1559–74.
- Champion, L. G.: *Benedictions and Doxologies in the Epistles of Paul*. Oxford: Kemp Hall Press, 1934.
- Charlesworth, James H, ed.: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1, *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1983.
- Colavito, Joseph: "Ethos." In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*, ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Garland Publishing, 1996.
- Collart, Paul: *Philippe, ville de Macédoine depuis ses origines jusqu'à la fin de l'époque romaine*. 2 vols. Paris: Boccard, 1937.
- Conzelmann, H.: *Bemerkungen zum Martyrium Polykarps*. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse; 1978, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Cook, J. M.: "Old Smyrna: 1948–1951." *Annual of the British School at Athens* 53/54 (1958/1959): 23–27.
- Corssen, Peter: "Die Vita Polycarpi." *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 5 (1904): 266–302.
- Corwin, Virginia: *St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch*. Yale Publications in Religion, 1. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.
- Cotelierius, J. B.: *Ss. patrum, qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt*. Antwerp: Huguetanorum, 1698.
- Couchoud, P. L.: "La Première Édition de Saint Paul." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 93 (1926): 242–263.
- Crouch, J. E.: *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 109. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.

- Crusé, C. F., ed.: *The "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius of Pamphilus, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine*. New York: G. Bell, 1892.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend*. Studies on Personalities of the New Testament. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup: "Der Erstgeborene Satans und der Väter des Teufels (Polyk 7:1 und Joh 8:44)." In *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964*, ed. by W. Eltester and F. H. Kettler, 70–84. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche, 30. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964.
- : "Origin of the Earliest Prologues to the Pauline Letters." *Semeia* 12 (1978): 233–277.
- : "The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church." In *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht*, 261–271. *Novum Testamentum Supplement*, 6. Leiden: Brill, 1962.
- : "Welche Ordnung der Paulusbriefe wird vom muratorischen Kanon vorausgesetzt?" *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 52 (1961): 39–53.
- Daillé, Jean: *De scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areopagitae et Ignatii Antiocheni nominibus circumferuntur*. Geneva: Ioannis Antonii & Samuelis de Tournes, 1666.
- : *Usu patrum ad ea definienda religionis capita, quae sunt hodie controversa*. Geneva: Petri Chouët, 1655.
- De Boer, Martinus C. de: "Comment: Which Paul." In *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*. Edited by William S. Babcock, 45–54. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.
- Dehandschutter, Boudewijn: "The Martyrium Polycarpi: A Century of Research." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.27.1, ed. Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini, 485–522. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.
- : *Martyrium Polycarpi: Een literair-kritische studie*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 52. Louvain: Universitaire Pers Leuven, 1979.
- : "Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: An Early Example of 'Reception.'" In *The New Testament in Early Christianity*, ed. Jean-Marie Sevrin, 275–291. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 86. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Delehaye, H.: *Sanctus: Essai sur le culte des saints dans l'antiquité*. *Subsidia hagiographica*, 17. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1927.
- Derrett, J. D. M.: "Scripture and Norms in the Apostolic Fathers." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.27.1, ed. Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini, 649–699. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.
- Devos, P.: "Notatio in Vitam S. Polycarpi." *Analecta Bollandiana* 110 (1992): 260–262.
- : Review of *Atti e passioni dei Martiri, Au près des saints corps et âme*, and *Étude sur les Gesta Martyrum romains*. In *Analecta Bollandiana* 107 (1989): 212–215.
- : "'META LABBATO' chez saint Épiphané." *Analecta Bollandiana* 108 (1990): 293–306.
- Dibelius, Martin: *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by B. L. Woolf. The Scribner's Library, 124. New York: Scribner's, n.d.

- : *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*. München: Kaiser, 1926.
- : *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. Translated by M. A. Williams. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976. Dibelius, Martin and Hans Conzelmann: *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. Translated by P. Buttolph and A. Yarbro. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Donahue, Paul J.: "Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch." *Vigilae Christianae* 32 (1978): 81–93.
- Donaldson, James: *The Apostolical Fathers: A Critical Account of their Genuine Writings and of their Doctrines*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1874.
- Doty, William G.: *Letters in Primitive Christianity*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship: New Testament Series. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973.
- Duchesne, L.: *Early History of the Christian Church: From Its Formation to the End of the Fifth Century*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1926.
- Eemeren, F. H. van and R. Grootendorst, eds.: *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions: A Theoretical Model for the Analysis of Discussions Directed Towards Solving Conflicts of Opinion*. Studies of Argumentation in Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis, 1. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, 1984.
- Ehninger, Douglas and Wayne Brockriede: *Decision by Debate*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Ellis, E. Earle: Review of *Die Polycarpbriefe*, by J. B. Bauer. In *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 38 (1996): 55.
- Essig, K.-G.: "Mutmaßungen über den Anlass des Martyriums von Ignatius von Antiochien." *Vigiliae Christianae* 40 (1986): 105–117.
- Evans, Craig A.: "Listening for Echoes of Interpreted Scripture." In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 47–51. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 83. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Evans, E.: *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Farkasfalvy, Denis M.: "'Prophets and Apostles': The Conjunction of the Two Terms before Irenaeus." In *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers*. Edited by W. Eugene March, 109–134. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1980.
- Farmer, William R. and Denis M. Farkasfalvy: *The Formation of the New Testament Canon: An Ecumenical Approach*. Theological Inquiries. New York: Paulist Press, 1983.
- : "Peter and Paul: A Constitutive Relationship for Catholic Christianity." In *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church*. Edited by W. Eugene March, 219–236. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1980.
- Ferguson, E.: "Canon Muratori: Date and Provenance," *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982): 677–683.
- : Review of *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*, by Geoffrey Mark Hahneman. In *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 44 (1993): 696.
- Fiore, B.: *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1986.
- Fischer, Joseph Anton: *Die Apostolischen Väter*. München, Kosel, 1956.

- Fishbane, Michael: *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Foakes-Jackson, Frederick John: *The History of the Christian Church from the Earliest Times to A.D. 461*. 6th ed. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1914.
- Foster, John: "Note on St. Polycarp." *Expository Times* 77 (1966): 319.
- Frei, W.: "Bischof Polykarp von Smyrna und die beginnende Heiligenverehrung." *Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift* 72 (1983): 207–213.
- Freund, W. H. C.: "Christianity in the Second Century: Orthodoxy and Diversity." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48 (1997): 302–313.
- : Review of *Bearbeitungen und Interpolationen des Polykarpmartyriums*, by Hans Frhr. von Campenhausen. In *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 9 (1958): 370–373.
- : "Note on the Chronology of the Martyrdom of Polycarp and the Outbreak of Montanism." In *Oikoumene: Studi paleocristiani pubblicati in onore del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II*, 499–506. Catania: Università di Catania, 1964.
- Funk, Franz Xaver: *Die Apostolischen Väter*. Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, 2.1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1901.
- : *Die Echtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe mit einer literarischen Beilage, die alte lateinische Übersetzung der Usher'schen Sammlung der Ignatiusbriefe und des Polykarpbriefes*. Tübingen: H. Laupp, 1883.
- : *Opera patrum apostolicorum: textum recensuit, adnotationibus criticis exegeticis historicis illustravit, versionem latinam, prolegomena indices addidit*. Tübingen: H. Laupp, 1881.
- : *Patres Apostolici*. Tübingen: H. Laupp, 1913.
- Furnish, Victor Paul: *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.
- Gamble, Harry Y.: *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship: New Testament Series. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Gammie, John G.: "Paraenetic Literature: Toward the Morphology of a Secondary Genre." *Semeia* 50 (1990): 41–77.
- Gebhardt, Oscar de, Adolfus Harnack, Theodorus Zahn, ed.: *Patrum apostolicorum opera: Textum ad fidem codicum et graecorum et latinorum adhibitis praestantissimis editionibus*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1875.
- Genouillac, Henri de: *L'église chrétienne au temps de saint Ignace d'Antioche*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1907.
- Glimm, Francis X.: "The Letter of St. Polycarp to the Philippians." In *The Apostolic Fathers*. Translated by Francis X. Glimm, Joseph M.-F. Marique, and Gerald G. Walsh. The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation. New York: Cima Publishing Co., Inc., 1947.
- Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson: *The Formation of the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926.
- : *New Solutions of New Testament Problems*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson and Robert M. Grant: *A History of Early Christian Literature*. Revised and Enlarged by Robert M. Grant. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Grant, Michael: *A Guide to the Ancient World: A Dictionary of Classical Place Names*. Bronx: H. W. Wilson Company, 1986.
- Grant, Robert M.: *The Formation of the New Testament*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

- : *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
- : “Jewish Christianity at Antioch in the Second Century.” *Recherches de sciences religieuses* 60 (1972): 97–108.
- : “Polycarp of Smyrna.” *Anglican Theological Review* 28 (1946): 137–148.
- : “The Study of the Early Fathers in Modern Times.” Chap. in *After the New Testament: Studies on Early Christian Literature and Theology*, 3–19. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.
- Green, W. S.: “Doing the Text’s Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul’s Use of Scripture.” In *Paul and the Scriptures of Paul*. Edited by C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, 58–63. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Series, 83. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Greer, R. A.: “Scriptural Authority (in the Early Church).” In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Grégoire, Henri, et al: *Les persecutions dans l’Empire romain*. 2nd ed. Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1964.
- Grégoire, H. and P. Orgels: “La véritable date du martyre de S. Polycarpe (23 février 177) et le ‘Corpus Polycarpianum.’” *Analecta Bollandiana* 69 (1951): 1–38.
- Gregory, Caspar René: *Canon and Text of the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1929.
- Griffe, E.: “Un nouvel article sur la date du martyre de saint Polycarpe.” *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 54 (1953): 178–181.
- : “A propos de la date du martyre de S. Polycarpe.” *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 54 (1953): 178–181.
- Groß, W. H.: “M. Ulpius Traianus.” In *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Supplementband X. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag, 1965.
- Guillaumin, Marie L.: “En marge du ‘Martyre de Polycarpe’: Le discernement des allusions scripturaires.” In *Forma futuri: Studi in onore del Cardinale Michele Pellegrino*, 462–469. Turin: Bottega d’Erasmus, 1975.
- Hagner, D. A.: *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 34. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Hahneman, Geoffrey Mark: *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Halloix, P.: *Illustrium ecclesiae orientalis scriptorum, qui sanctitate iuxta et eruditione, primo Christi saeculo floruerunt, et apostolis convixerunt, vitae et documenta*. Douay: P. Bogardi, 1633.
- Hammond, N. G. L.: “The Western Part of the Via Egnatia.” *Journal of Roman Studies* 64 (1974): 185–194.
- Hanson, R. P. C.: *Tradition in the Early Church*. The Library of History and Doctrine. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Harden, J. M.: *The Ethiopic Didascala*. Translations of Christian Literature. Series IV: Oriental Texts. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920.
- Harnack, Adolf von: “Bishop Lightfoot’s ‘Ignatius and Polycarp.’” *Expositor* 2 (1885): 402–414.

- : *Die Briefsammlung des Apostels Paulus, und die anderen vorkonstantinischen christlichen Briefsammlungen. Sechs Vorlesungen aus der altkirchlichen Literaturgeschichte.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung, 1926.
- : *Die Chronologie der althristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897.
- : *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910.
- : *Geschichte der althristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius.* Part 1, vol. 1. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897.
- : “Lightfoot on the Ignatian Epistles.” *Expositor* 3 (1886): 175–192.
- : *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott; Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der Katholischen Kirche.* 2nd ed. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924.
- : *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God.* Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1990.
- : *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.* 2nd ed. Theological Translation Library. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1908.
- : *The Origin of the New Testament and the Most Important Consequences of the New Creation.* London: Macmillan, 1925.
- : *Die Zeit des Ignatius und die Chronologie der antiochenischen Bischöfe bis Tyrannus nach Julius Africanus und den späteren Historiken: Nebst einer Untersuchung über die Verbreitung des Passio S. Polycarpi im Abendlande.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1878.
- Harrill, James Albert: “Ignatius, *Ad Polycarp*. 4.3 and the Corporate Manumission of Christian Slaves,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1 (1993): 107–142.
- : *The Manumission of Slaves in Early Christianity.* Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie, 32. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Harrison, P. N.: *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936.
- Hays, Richard B.: *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- : “*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*: Abstract.” In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 42–46. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Series*, 83. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- : “On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*.” In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 70–96. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Series*, 83. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Headlam, A. C.: “The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians.” *Church Quarterly Review* 141 (1945): 1–25.
- Hefele, Carolus Josephus: *Patrum apostolicorum opera: textum ex editionibus praestantissimis repetitum recognovit annotationibusque illustravit, prolegomena et indicem.* 2nd ed. Tübingen: Henrici Laupp, 1842.
- Hemer, Colin J.: *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in Their Local Setting.* *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series*, 11. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986.
- Hendrix, Holland L.: “Philippi.” In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday,



- Hengel, Martin: *Die johanneische Frage: Ein Lösungsversuch*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.
- : *The Johannine Question*. London: SCM Press, 1989.
- Henne, Philippe: “La datation du Canon de Muratori.” *Revue biblique* 100 (1993): 54–75.
- Hilgenfeld, A.: *Die Apostolischen Väter: Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Ursprung der unter ihrem Namen erhaltenen Schriften*. Halle: C. E. M. Pfeffer, 1853.
- : “Eine dreiste Fälschung in alter Zeit und deren neueste Verteidigung.” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 48 (1905): 444–458.
- : *Ignatii Antiocheni et Polycarpi Smyrnaei: epistulae et martyria*. Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke, 1902.
- : “Die Ignatius-Briefe und ihr neuester Vertheidiger,” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 3 (1874): 96–121.
- : “Polykarp von Smyrna.” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 3 (1874): 305–345.
- Hill, C. E.: “The Debate over the Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon.” *Westminster Theological Journal* 57 (1995): 437–452.
- : “What Papias Said about John (and Luke): A ‘New’ Papias Fragment.” *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 49 (1998): 582–629.
- Hirsch, Emanuel: *Studien zum vierten Evangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1936.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph: *Marcion, On the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century*. American Academy of Religion Academy Series, 46. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.
- Holland, D. L.: “Some Issues in Orthodox-Gnostic Christian Polemics.” *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982): 214–222.
- Holmes, Michael W.: “A Note on the Text of Polycarp *Philippians* 11.3.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 51 (1997): 207–210.
- Holtzmann, H. J.: “Das Verhältnis des Johannes zu Ignatius und Polykarp.” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 22 (1877): 187–214.
- Howard, W. F.: “The Anti-Marcionite Prologues to the Gospels.” *Expository Times* 47 (1936): 534–538.
- Isenberg, Sheldon R.: “An Anti-Sadducee Polemic in the Palestinian Targum Tradition.” *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970): 433–444.
- Jacquier, E.: *Le Nouveau Testament dans l’église chrétienne*. 2nd ed. Paris: Gabalda, 1911.
- Jervis, L. A.: *The Purpose of Romans: A Comparative Letter Structure Investigation*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series, 55. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Jewett, R.: “The Form and Function of the Homiletic Benediction.” *Anglican Theological Review* 51 (1969): 18–34.
- Johnson, Nan: “Pathos.” In *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition: Communication from Ancient Times to the Information Age*, ed. Theresa Enos. New York: Garland Publishing, 1996.
- Johnson, Sherman E.: “Asia Minor and Early Christianity,” In *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, ed. J. Neusner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975.

- : “Parallels between the Letters of Ignatius and the Johannine Epistles.” In *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen’s Sixtieth Birthday, July 28, 1985*. Edited by Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing, 327–338. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- Joly, R.: *Le dossier d’Ignace d’Antioche*. Université Libre de Bruxelles, Faculté de philosophie et lettres, 69. Brussels: Éditions de l’Université de Bruxelles, 1979.
- Karpinsky, P.: *Annua dies dormitionis: Untersuchungen zum christlichen Jahrgedächtnis der Toten auf dem Hintergrund antiken Brauchtums*. Frankfurt: Lang, 1987.
- Keim, Theodor: *Aus dem Urchristenthum: Geschichtliche Untersuchungen in zwangloser Folge*. Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1878.
- : *Rom und das Christenthum*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1881.
- Kennedy, George Alexander: *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*. Studies in Religion. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Killen, W. D.: *The Ignatian Epistles Entirely Spurious: A Reply to the Right Rev. Dr. Lightfoot, Bishop of Durham*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1886.
- Kim, C.-H.: *Form and Structure of the Familiar Greek Letter Recommendation*. SBL Dissertation Series, 4. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1972.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef: *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum*. Stuttgarter Biblestudien, 103. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.
- Kleist, James A.: *The Didache; The Epistle of Barnabas; The Epistles and the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp; The Fragments of Papias; The Epistle to Diognetus*. Ancient Christian Writers Series, 6. Westminster: Newman Press, 1948.
- Klevinghaus, J.: *Die theologische Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur alttestamentlichen Offenbarung*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 44.1. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1948.
- Knopf, R.: *Die Apostolischen Väter*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1920.
- Knox, John: “Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus.” In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- : *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- Koch, D.-A.: *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. BHT, 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- Koester, Helmut: *Introduction to the New Testament*. Vol. 2, *History and Literature of Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- : *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.
- Köhler, Wolf-Dietrich: *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.
- Koskeniemi, Heikki: *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedakatemia, 1956.

- Koukouli-Chrysantaki, Chaido: "Colonia Iulia Augusta Philippensis." In *Philippi at the Time of Paul and after His Death*. Edited by Charalambos Bakirtzis and Helmut Koester, 5–35. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1998.
- Kraft, Robert A.: *Barnabas and the Didache*. Apostolic Fathers, 3. New York: T. Nelson, 1964.
- Kristeva, J.: *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Translated by Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- Krüger, G.: "Briefe des Ignatius und Polykarp." In *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, ed. Edgar Hennecke, 190–203. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1904.
- Kühner, Raphael: *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. 3rd ed. Edited by Bernard Gerth. Hannover: Hahn, 1904.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg: *Introduction to the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.
- Laeuchli, S.: "The Drama of Replay." In *Searching in the Syntax of Things: Experiments in the Study of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972: 69–126.
- Lake, Kirsopp, trans.: *The Apostolic Fathers*. Vol. 1, *I Clement, II Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache, Barnabas*. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1912.
- Lampe, G. W. H., ed.: *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Lelong, A.: *Les Pères Apostoliques*. 2nd ed. Textes et documents pour l'étude historique du christianisme. Paris: A. Picard, 1927.
- Lemcio, E. E.: "Ephesus and the New Testament Canon." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 69 (1986): 210–234.
- Le Moine, Étienne: *Varia sacra ceu sylloge variorum*. Lugduni Batavorum: Cornelius Boutesteyn, 1694.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by Henry Stuart Jones. With a revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Lieu, Judith M.: *The Second and Third Epistles of John: History and Background Studies of the New Testament in Its World*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986, 125–135.
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber: *The Apostolic Fathers*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1889; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1973.
- : *Essays on the Work Entitled "Supernatural Religion."* 2nd ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1893.
- Lindemann, Andreas: "Paul in the Writings of the Apostolic Fathers." In *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*. Edited by William S. Babcock, 25–45. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.
- : *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979.
- Lindemann, Andreas and Henning Paulsen, eds.: *Die Apostolischen Väter: Griechische-deutsche Parallelausgabe auf der Grundlage der Ausgaben der Franz Xaver Funk/Karl Bihlmeyer und Molly Whittaker*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

- Lipsius, R. A.: *Chronologie der Römischen Bischöfe bis zur Mitte des vierten Jahrhunderts*. Kiel: Schwer, 1869.
- : “Der Märtyretod Polykarps.” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 17 (1874): 204–206.
- : *Über das Verhältnis des Textes der drei syrischen Briefe des Ignatios zu den übrigen Recensionen der Ignatianischen Literatur*. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1859.
- Loewenich, W.: *Das Johannes-Verständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 13. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1932.
- Lohmann, H.: *Drohung und Verheißung: Exegetische Untersuchungen zur Eschatologie bei den Apostolischen Vätern*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 55. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989.
- Luz, Ulrich: *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 1. Zürich: Benzinger, 1985.
- Mackinnon, James: *From Christ to Constantine: The Rise and Growth of the Early Church (c. A.D. 30 to 337)*. London: Longmans, Green, 1936.
- Magie, David: *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ*. Princeton: Princeton University, 1950.
- Maier, Harry O.: “Purity and Danger in Polycarp’s Epistle to the Philippians: The Sin of Valens in Social Perspective.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 1 (1993): 229–247.
- Malherbe, Abraham J.: *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Library of Early Christianity, 4. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- : *The Cynic Epistles: A Study of Religion*. Sources for Biblical Study, 12. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Marrou, H. I.: Review of *Bearbeitungen und Interpolationen des Polykarp-martyriums*, by H. von Campenhausen. In *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 84 (1959): 361–363.
- : “La Date du Martyre de S. Polycarpe.” *Analecta Bollandiana* 71 (1953): 5–20.
- Marshall, Murray M., Jr.: “The Use of the Books of the New Testament by the Early Christian Writers, Clement of Rome, Polycarp of Smyrna and Irenaeus of Lyons.” M.A. thesis, Eastern New Mexico University, 1950.
- Massaux, Édouard: *Influence de l’Évangile de saint Matthieu sur la littérature chrétienne avant saint Irénée*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 75. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1986.
- Maurer, C.: *Ignatius von Antiochien und das Johannesevangelium*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 18. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1949.
- McNamara, Martin: *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*. *Analecta biblica*, 27. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.
- McNeile, A. H.: *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*. 2nd rev. ed. Revised by C. S. C. Williams. Oxford: Oxford University, 1953.
- Meinhold, Peter: “Polykarpos.” In *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 21, Part 2. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag, 1952.
- Michael, John Hugh: *The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians*. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Doubleday, 1927.

- Michiels, Andreas: *L'origine de l'épiscopat*. Louvain: n.p., 1900.
- Moffatt, James: "An Approach to Ignatius." *Harvard Theological Review* 29 (1936): 1–38.
- : *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. 3rd ed. The International Theological Library. Edinburgh: Clark, 1918.
- Molland, Einar: "The Heretics Combated by Ignatius of Antioch." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954): 1–6.
- Moreau, J.: *Die Christenverfolgung im römischen Reich*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1971.
- Moss, Jean Dietz: "The Revival of Practical Reasoning." In *Rhetoric and Praxis: The Contribution of Classical Rhetoric to Practical Reasoning*. Edited by J. D. Moss. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1986.
- Muehlenberg, Ekkehard: "Marcion's Jealous God." In *Disciplina Nostra: Essays in Memory of Robert F. Evans*. Edited by Donald F. Winslow. Patristic Monograph Series, 6. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd., 1979.
- Müller, H.: "Aus der Überlieferungsgeschichte des Polykarp-Martyrium." Ph.D. diss., University of Paderborn, 1908.
- : "Das Martyrium Polycarpi: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Heiligengeschichte." *Römische Quartalschrift* 22 (1980): 1–16.
- Murray, Mary Charles: Review of *Die Polykarpbriefe*, by J. B. Bauer. In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48 (1997): 326–327.
- Musurillo, H.: *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Nautin, Pierre: *Lettres et écrivains chrétiens des II<sup>e</sup> et III<sup>e</sup> siècles*. Paris: Cerf, 1961.
- : "Polycarp." In *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, ed. Angelo Di Berardino. Translated by Adrian Walford. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1998. S.v. "Polycarp."
- Newman, J. H.: "The Theology of the Seven Epistles of St. Ignatius of Antioch." In *Essays Critical and Historical*. Vol. 1. London: B. M. Pickering, 1873.
- Nicholls, R. V.: "Old Smyrna: Its Iron Age Fortifications and Associated Remains on the City Perimeter." *Annual of the British School at Athens* 53/54 (1958/1959): 88–91, 128–134.
- Nielsen, Charles M.: "Polycarp and Marcion: A Note." *Theological Studies* 47 (1986): 297–299.
- : "Polycarp, Paul and the Scriptures." *Anglican Theological Review* 47 (1965): 199–216.
- Norden, Eduard: *Die Antike Kunstprosa*. 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1958.
- Norris, Frederick W.: "Ignatius, Polycarp, and 1 Clement: Walter Bauer Reconsidered." *Vigiliae Christianae* 30 (1976): 23–44.
- Orbán, A. P.: "Martyrium Polycarpi." Trans. Silvia Ronchey. In *Atti e Passioni dei martiri*, ed. A. A. R. Bastiaensen, 3–31. Scrittori greci e latini. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1987.
- Orr, J.: *Progress of Dogma*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- Oxford Society of Historical Theology: *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1905.

- Parkin, Tim G.: *Demography and Roman Society*. Ancient Society and History. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Paulsen, H.: *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Brief des Polykarp von Smyrna*. Based upon the work of W. Bauer. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 18. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985.
- : *Studien zur Theologie des Ignatius von Antiochien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Pearson, Birger A.: “Cain and the Cainites.” Chap. in *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Pearson, Joanne: *Ss. Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt opera, Barnabae, Clementis, Hermiae, Ignatii, Polycarpi opera edita et inedita, vera, & supposititia, unà cum Clementis, Ignatii, Polycarpi, actis atque martyriis*. Antwerp: Huguetanorum sumtibus, 1698.
- : *Vindiciae epistolarum S. Ignatii*. Cambridge: Joann. Hayes, 1672.
- Perdue, Leo G.: “The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature.” *Semeia* 50 (1990): 5–39.
- Perelman, Chaïm and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca: *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- Perler, O.: Review of *Ignace d'Antioche*, by T. Camelot. *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 43 (1957): 357–358.
- Peterson, Erik: *Eis Theos: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.
- Pfleiderer, Otto: *Primitive Christianity: Its Writings and Teachings in Their Historical Connections*. 2nd ed. Translated by W. Montgomery. Theological Translation Library. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1911.
- : *Das Urchristentum: Seine Schriften und Lehren in geschichtlichem Zusammenhang*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1887.
- Photius: *Bibliothèque*, ed. René Henry. Paris: Société D'Édition “Les Belles Lettres,” 1960.
- Pilhofer, Peter: *Philippi*. Vol. 1, *Die erste christliche Gemeinde Europas*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 87. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Pollard, T. E.: “John the Evangelist, Gospel of.” In *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. Edited by Angelo Di Berardino. Translated by Adrian Walford. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Porter, Stanley: “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology.” In *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 79–96. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 148. Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, 5. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1997.
- Potter, D. S.: “Smyrna,” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Prigent, P.: “L'hérésie asiatic et l'église confessant de l'Apocalypse à Ignace.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 31 (1977): 1–22.

- Prostmeier, Ferdinand R.: "Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung des Polykarp- und des Barnabasbriefes: Zwei nicht beachtete Deszendenten des Cod. Vat. Gr. 859." *Vigiliae Christianae* 48 (1994): 48–64.
- Puech, Henri-Charles: Review of *Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians*, by P. N. Harrison. In *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 119 (1939): 96–102.
- Quasten, J.: *Patrology*. Vol. 1: *The Beginnings of Patristic Literature*. Westminster: Newman Press, 1949.
- : *Patrology*. Vol. 2: *The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*. Westminster: Newman Press, 1953.
- Quinn, Jerome D.: "P<sup>46</sup> – The Pauline Canon?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 379–385.
- : "Paraenesis and the Pastoral Epistles: Lexical Observations Bearing on the Nature of the Sub-genre and Soundings in its Role in Socialization and Liturgies." *Semeia* 50 (1990): 189–210.
- Quispel, Gilles: "Marcion and the Text of the New Testament." *Vigiliae Christianae* 52 (1998): 349–360.
- Rackl, M.: *Christologie des heiligen Ignatius von Antiochien: Nebst einer Voruntersuchung: Die Echtheit der sieben Ignatianischen Briefe verteidigt gegen Daniel Völter*. Freiburger theologische Studien, 14. Freiburg: Herder, 1914.
- Ramsay, W. M.: "The Date of St. Polycarp's Martyrdom." *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 28 (1932): 245–250.
- : "Roads and Travel (in the New Testament)." In *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- Rathke, Heinrich: *Ignatius von Antiochien und die Paulusbriefe*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 99. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1967.
- Reinach, W.: "Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, and Archeia." In *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, ed. William Hepburn H. Buckler and William Moir Calder. University of Manchester Publications. Manchester: University Press, 1923.
- Renan, Ernest: *Der Antichrist*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1873.
- : *L'église chrétienne*. 2nd ed. Histoire des origines du christianisme, 6. Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1922.
- Rensberger, David K.: "As the Apostle Teaches: The Development of the Use of Paul's Letters in Second-Century Christianity." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981.
- Reunig, Wilhelm: *Zur Erklärung des Polykarpmartyriums*. Darmstadt: C. F. Winter, 1917.
- Réville, Jean: *De anno dieque quibus Polycarpus Smyrnae martyrium tulit*. Geneva: Caroli Schuchardt, 1880.
- : "Études sur les origines de l'épiscopat." *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 22 (1890).
- Richardson, Cyril Charles: *The Christianity of Ignatius*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1935.
- : *Early Christian Fathers*. Library of Christian Classics, 1. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Ritschl, A.: *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche: Eine kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Monographie*. 2nd ed. Bonn: A. Marcus, 1857.

- Rius-Camps, Joseph: *The Four Authentic Letters of Ignatius, the Martyr: A Critical Study Based on the Anomalies Contained in the Textus Receptus*. Orientalia Christiana analecta, 213. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1979.
- Robinson, Thomas A.: *The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Christian Church*. Lewiston: The Edward Mellen Press, 1988.
- Rordorf, W.: "Aux origines du culte des martyrs." *Irenikon* 45 (1972): 315–331.
- : "Martyre et Témoignage: Essai de réponse à une question difficile." In *Liturgie, Foi et Vie des premiers Chrétiens: Études patristiques*. Théologie historique, 75. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.
- : "Zum Problem des 'Großen Sabbats' im Polykarp- und Pioniusmartyrium." In *Pietas: Festschrift für Bernhard Kötting*. Ed. Ernst Dassmann and Suso Frank, 245–249. Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, 8. Münster: Aschendorff, 1980.
- Salmon, G.: "Polycarpus." In *A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines; During the First Eight Centuries*, ed. William Smith and Henry Wace. London: J. Murray, 1911.
- Sanders, J. N.: *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus*. Cambridge: University Press, 1943.
- Saxer, V.: "L'authenticité du 'Martyre de Polycarpe': Bilan de 25 ans de critique." *Mélanges de l'école française de Rome, Antiquité* 94 (1982): 979–1001.
- Schaff, Philip: *History of the Christian Church*. 3rd ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.
- Schlatter, F. W.: "The Restoration of Peace in Ignatius' Antioch." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 35 (1984): 465–469.
- Schmid, Ulrich: *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbrieffausgabe*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
- Schmid, W.: "Die Lebensgeschichte des Rhetors Aristides." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* N.F. 48 (1893): 53–83.
- Schmidt, Carl, ed.: *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung ein katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrhunderts nach einem koptischen Papyrus des Institut de la mission archéol. française au Caire unter Mitarbeit von Herrn Pierre Lacau*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 43. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1919.
- Schmithals, Walter: *Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 48. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- : "On the Composition and Earliest Collection of the Major Epistles of Paul." In *Paul and the Gnostics*. Translated by J. Steely, 239–274. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- : "Zur Abfassung und ältesten Sammlung der paulinischen Hauptbriefe." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und der Kunde Älteren Kirche* 51 (1960): 225–245.
- Schneemelcher, W.: "Paulus in der griechischen Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 75 (1964): 1–20.



- Schoedel, William R.: "Ignatius and the Archives." *Harvard Theological Review* 71 (1978): 97–106.
- : *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- : "Polycarp, Epistle of." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- : *Polycarp, Martyrdom of Polycarp, Fragments of Papias*. Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary, 5. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1967.
- : "Polycarp of Smyrna and Ignatius of Antioch." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.27.1, ed. Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini, 272–358. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993.
- : "Polycarp's Witness to Ignatius of Antioch." *Vigiliae Christianae* 41 (1987): 1–10.
- Schöllgen, G.: "Monepiskopat und monarchischer Episkopat: Eine Bemerkung zur Terminologie." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 77 (1986): 146–151.
- Schubert, Paul: *The Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 20. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1939.
- Schwartz, Eduard: *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1905.
- : *De Pionio et Polycarpo*. Göttingen: Officina Academica Dieterichiana, 1905.
- Schwartz, J.: "Note sur le martyre de Polycarpe de Smyrne." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 52 (1972): 331–335.
- Schwegler, Albert: *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung*. Vol. 1. Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues, 1846.
- Schweizer, E.: "Der zweite Thessalonicherbrief ein Philipperbrief?" *Theologische Zeitschrift* 1 (1945): 90–105.
- Sellew, Philip: "Laodiceans and the Philippians Fragments Hypothesis." *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994) 17–28.
- Selwyn, Edward Gordon: *The First Epistle of Peter: The Greek Text*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1947.
- Simonin, H. D.: *Historicae disquisitiones ad doctrinam Christologicam*. Rome: Angelicum, 1938.
- Snyder, G. F.: "Polycarp." In *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1990.
- Souter, Alexander: *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. Revised by C. S. C. Williams. Studies in Theology. London: Duckworth, 1960.
- Stambaugh, J. E. and D. L. Balch: *The New Testament in Its Social Environment*. Library of Early Christianity, 2. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Stanley, C. D.: *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS, 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Steinhauser, Kenneth B.: "Authority in the Primitive Church." *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 3 (1984): 89–100.

- Steinmetz, Peter: "Polykarp von Smyrna über die Gerechtigkeit." *Hermes* 100 (1972): 63–75.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent: *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Library of Early Christianity, 5. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- : "Letters (Greek and Latin Letters)." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Strecker, G.: "Paulus in nachpaulinischer Zeit." *Kairos* 12 (1970): 208–216.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman: *The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry*. London: Macmillan, 1929.
- Strobel, August: *Das heilige Land der Montanisten: Eine religionsgeographische Untersuchung*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, 37. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- Stuckwisch, D. Richard: "Saint Polycarp of Smyrna: Johannine or Pauline Figure?" *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 61 (1997): 113–125.
- Stuiber, A.: "Geburstag." In *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 9 (1973): 217–243.
- Sundberg, A. C.: "Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List." *Harvard Theological Review* 66 (1973): 1–41.
- : "Towards A Revised History of the New Testament Canon." *Studia Evangelica* 4 (1968): 452–461.
- Swete, Henry Barclay: *The Apocalypse of John: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1907.
- Tabbernee, William: "Early Montanism and Voluntary Martyrdom." *Colloquium* 17 (1985): 33–44.
- Tanner, R. G.: "Martyrdom in Saint Ignatius of Antioch and the Stoic View of Suicide." *Studia Patristica* 16 (1985): 201–205.
- Telfer, William: "The Date of the Martyrdom of Polycarp." *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 3 (1952): 79–83.
- Tentzelius, W. E.: *Exercitationes selectae in duas partes*. Leipzig, 1692.
- Thayer, John Henry: *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Rev. ed. New York: American Book Company, 1889.
- Thompson, J. David and J. Arthur Baird: *A Critical Concordance to the Epistle of Saint Polycarp to the Philippians*. The Computer Bible, 47. Wooster: Biblical Research Associates, Inc., 1996.
- Thompson, M.: *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1–15.13*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 59. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Thurén, Lauri: *Argument and Theology in 1 Peter: The Origins of Christian Paraenesis*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, 114. Sheffield: JSOT, 1995.
- Townsend, John T.: "The Contributions of John Knox to the Study of Acts: Some Further Notations." In *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts*, ed. Mikeal C. Parsons and Joseph B. Tyson, 81–89. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- : "The Date of Luke-Acts." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Ed. Charles H. Talbert, 47–62. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

- Trevett, C.: "Approaching Matthew from the Second Century: The Under-Used Ignatian Correspondence." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20 (1984): 59–67.
- : "Prophecy and Anti-Episcopal Activity: A Third Error Combated by Ignatius?" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 34 (1983): 1–18.
- Turnel, Joseph: *Lettres d'Ignace d'Antioche*. Paris: Éditions Rieder, 1927.
- Turner, C. H.: "The Day and Year of St. Polycarp's Martyrdom." *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* 2 (1890): 105–155.
- : *Studies in Early Church History: Collected Papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- Tyson, Joseph B.: "John Knox and the Acts of the Apostles." In *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts*, ed. Mikeal C. Parsons and Joseph B. Tyson, 55–80. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Ussher, Jacob: *Polycarpi et Ignatii epistolae*. Oxford: Leonardus Licfield, 1644.
- Vielhauer, Philipp: *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975.
- Volkmar, G.: "Polykarp von Smyrna." *Theologische Zeitschrift* (1886): 99–111.
- Völter, Daniel: *Polykarp und Ignatius und die ihnen zugeschriebenen Briefe*. Die Apostolischen Väter: Neu Untersucht, 2a. Leiden: Brill, 1910.
- von der Goltz, E.: *Ignatius von Antiochien als Christ und Theologe: Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 12. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1894.
- Waddington, W. H.: "Mémoire sur la chronologie de la vie du rhéteur Aelius Aristide," *Mémoires de l'Institut impérial de France (Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres)* 26 (1867): 203–368.
- Wagenmann, Julius: *Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf in den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten*. Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 3. Gießen: A. Töpelmann, 1926.
- Wake, William: *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers, St. Clement, St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, St. Barnabas; the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp*. Hartford: Parsons and Hills, 1834.
- Walls, A. F.: "Papias and Oral Tradition." *Vigiliae Christianae* 21 (1967): 137–140.
- Weidmann, Frederick: "Intertextuality and Intent: John and the Apostolic Mission in the Harris Fragments on Polycarp." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, Jr, 394–398. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- : *Polycarp and John: The Harris Fragments and Their Challenge to the Literary Traditions*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss: *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament*. Literature of Theology and Church History. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1880.
- White, John Lee: *Light from Ancient Letters*. Foundations and Facets. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Wieseler, Karl George: *Die Christenverfolgungen der Cäsaren bis zum dritten Jahrhundert*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1878.

- Williams, Daniel H.: "Harnack, Marcion and the Argument of Antiquity." In *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Wendy E. Helleman, 224–240. Lanham: University Press of America, 1994.
- Wilshire, Leland Edward: "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century? – A Continuing Discussion." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 246–253.
- Wilson, J. Christian: "Polycarp." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Wilson, Stephen G.: "Marcion and the Jews." In *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Vol. 2, *Separation and Polemic*. Edited by Stephen G. Wilson, 45–58. Studies in Christianity and Judaism, 2. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986.
- Zahn, Theodor: *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*. Vol. 1: *Das Neue Testament von Origenes*. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1888.
- : *Ignatii et Polycarpi epistolae martyria fragmenta*. *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, 2. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1876.
- : *Introduction to the New Testament*. 3rd. ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1909.
- : *Ignatius von Antiochien*. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1873.



## Index of Authors

- Abrahams, I., 23, 53  
 Aichele, G., 192  
 Aland, B., 95, 213  
 Altaner, B., 150, 159  
 Andrews, H. T., 17, 20, 33, 66, 70, 77,  
     104, 169, 199  
 Aune, D. E., 48, 52, 87  
 Ayer, J. C., 169
- Baden, H., 19  
 Baird, J. A., 15, 229  
 Balás, D. L., 90, 96, 97, 215, 218, 222  
 Balch, D., 55, 125  
 Bardenhewer, O., 176, 224  
 Bardy, G., 161  
 Barnard, L. W., 10, 21, 66, 89, 97, 104,  
     150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157,  
     158, 159, 164, 166, 170, 173, 200,  
     233, 235  
 Barnes, T. D., 20, 26, 28, 29  
 Barnett, A. E., 172, 175, 178, 205, 216,  
     224  
 Barnikol, E., 92, 99, 100, 215  
 Baronius, C., 4, 5  
 Barrett, C. K., 179, 217, 218, 219, 221  
 Batiffol, P., 8, 15, 20, 36, 61, 64, 65, 165  
 Bauckham, R., 40  
 Bauer, J. B., 8, 10, 12, 13, 26, 32, 67, 79,  
     121, 124, 144, 158, 211, 215, 220,  
     229, 231  
 Bauer, W., 11, 43, 50, 57, 80, 84, 91,  
     101, 103, 104, 112, 196, 217, 219,  
     222, 224, 233  
 Baumeister, T., 21  
 Baur, F. B., 5, 6  
 Beker, J. C., 173, 229  
 Berding, K., 14, 170, 176, 233  
 Best, E., 56  
 Bihlmeyer, K., 7, 11, 33, 67, 190  
 Blackman, E. C., 91, 92, 94, 96, 100, 185,  
     205, 207, 209, 211, 213, 214, 215,  
     218, 234
- Blondell, D., 4, 5  
 Blum, G. G., 220  
 Bonner, G., 222  
 Bormann, L., 56  
 Bovon-Thurneysen, A., 13, 65, 74, 116,  
     117, 133, 136, 175, 180, 190, 193,  
     201, 228  
 Bowersock, G. W., 24  
 Bowker, J., 102  
 Branscomb, H., 218  
 Braun, F.-M., 187  
 Bremmer, J. N., 21  
 Brind'Amour, P., 23, 24, 26  
 Brisbee, G. A., 24  
 Brockriede, W., 134  
 Brown, R. E., 196  
 Burgess, T. C., 122  
 Burton, E., 26, 35, 37, 41, 48, 58, 64, 86  
 Buschmann, G., 19, 25
- Cacitti, R., 19  
 Cadoux, C. J., 10, 26, 33, 36, 37, 41, 45,  
     46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 58, 59, 60, 62,  
     63, 65, 75, 82, 85, 92, 96, 105, 151,  
     152, 157, 158  
 Camelot, P. T., 11, 25, 32, 33, 36, 37, 57,  
     64, 68, 69, 72, 85, 90, 92, 103, 105,  
     112, 152, 157, 158, 160, 162, 190,  
     224, 226  
 Campenhausen, H. F. von, 12, 19, 20, 25,  
     42, 50, 91, 186, 187, 188, 189, 201,  
     207, 209, 211, 214, 216, 217, 219,  
     228, 229, 234  
 Centuriatores Magdeburgensis, 3  
 Champion, L. G., 119  
 Charlesworth, J. H., 47  
 Colavito, J., 133  
 Collart, P., 54  
 Conzelmann, H., 20, 178, 201  
 Cook, J. M., 44  
 Corssen, P., 26, 33  
 Corwin, V., 9, 15, 59, 60, 75, 84, 85, 104,

- Corwin (continued)  
 105, 142, 153, 154  
 Cotelierius, J. B., 61  
 Couchoud, P. L., 195  
 Crouch, J. E., 125  
 Crusé, C. F., 23  
 Culpepper, R. A., 38
- Dahl, N. A., 14, 101, 102, 103, 225, 233, 234  
 Daillé, J., 4, 5, 64, 117, 148  
 De Boer, Martinus C., 16, 144, 216, 219, 221  
 De Bruyne, 92  
 Dehandschutter, B., 14, 18, 21, 22, 31, 32, 33, 26, 62, 63, 65, 67, 124, 127, 128, 161, 163, 172, 180, 183, 189, 191, 193, 198, 200, 202, 203, 204, 205, 207, 210, 213, 231, 232  
 Delehay, H., 32, 163, 220  
 Derrett, J. D. M., 17, 190  
 Devos, P., 23  
 Dibelius, M., 65, 126, 178, 201  
 Donahue, P. J., 104  
 Donaldson, J., 6, 9, 19, 22, 24, 27, 31, 36, 40, 41, 42, 50, 51, 62, 64, 65, 71, 72, 86, 104, 135, 149, 168, 170, 175, 176, 180, 204, 207, 208  
 Doty, W. G., 110, 111, 118, 127  
 Duchesne, L., 169, 234
- Eemeren, F. H. van, 133  
 Ehninger, D., 134  
 Essig, K.-G., 59  
 Evans, E., 214, 224, 225
- Farkasfalvy, D. M., 172, 187, 189, 202, 203, 208, 209, 211, 215, 217, 219  
 Farmer, W. R., 7, 100, 172, 187, 189, 288, 202, 208, 209, 211, 215, 217, 219  
 Ferguson, E., 39  
 Fiore, B., 122  
 Fischer, J. A., 150, 157, 159  
 Fishbane, M., 173  
 Foakes-Jackson, F. J., 17  
 Foster, J., 40  
 Frei, W., 53  
 Friend, W. H. C., 20, 24, 25, 26  
 Funk, F. X., 6, 11, 67, 68, 170, 176  
 Furnish, V. P., 126
- Gamble, H. Y., 186, 187, 189, 208, 210, 211, 213, 214, 225, 233, 234  
 Gammie, J. G., 122, 127, 130, 131  
 Gebhardt, O. de, 69  
 Genouillac, H., d, 76  
 Glimm, F. X., 33, 39, 87, 93, 150, 159  
 Goodspeed, E. J., 25, 50, 61, 76, 77, 84, 85, 91, 105, 160, 167, 169, 179, 184, 185, 187, 190, 212, 214, 216, 217, 227, 232, 233, 235  
 Grant, M., 44, 54  
 Grant., R. M., 3, 16, 17, 25, 50, 61, 76, 77, 80, 83, 84, 85, 100, 104, 105, 118, 160, 167, 170, 172, 173, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 194, 195, 199, 200, 204, 206, 207, 208, 212, 214, 225, 226, 227, 230, 233, 234  
 Green, W. W., 192  
 Greer, R. A., 212  
 Grégoire, H., 8, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 36  
 Gregory, C. R., 208  
 Griffe, E., 26  
 Grootendorst, R., 133  
 Groß, W. H., 60  
 Guillaumin, M. L., 222
- Hagner, D. A., 191  
 Hahneman, G. M., 39  
 Halloix, P., 68  
 Hammond, N. G. L., 155  
 Hanson, R. P. C., 186, 219  
 Harden, J. M., 48  
 Harnack, A. von, 7, 8, 24, 26, 29, 38, 52, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 69, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 97, 98, 152, 165, 187, 213, 214, 215, 227, 235  
 Harrill, J. A., 87  
 Harrison, P. N., 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 33, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, 37, 51, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 66, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 103, 105, 113, 115, 129, 135, 138, 140, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 177, 178, 181, 184, 185, 188, 189, 190, 192, 194, 195, 196, 199, 204, 227, 234, 235  
 Hays, R. B., 173, 174, 191, 192  
 Headlam, A. C., 75, 96, 151, 165

- Hefele, C. J., 5  
 Hemer, C. J., 45, 47, 200  
 Hendrix, H. L., 55  
 Hengel, M., 40  
 Henne, P., 39  
 Hilgenfeld, A., 5, 6, 7, 48, 70, 93, 104, 178, 226  
 Hill, C. E., 39, 186, 187  
 Hirsch, E., 63  
 Hoffmann, R. J., 91, 94, 99, 100, 229  
 Holland, D. L., 103  
 Holmes, M. W., 15, 225, 206  
 Holtzman, H. J., 18  
 Howard, W. F., 92, 94  
  
 Isenberg, S. R., 102  
 Ittis, 61  
  
 Jacobson, 86  
 Jacquier, E., 186  
 Jervis, L. A., 113  
 Jewett, R., 119  
 Johnson, N., 133  
 Johnson, S. E., 105, 189, 196  
 Joly, R., 9, 71, 113, 149  
  
 Karpinsky, P., 21  
 Keim, T., 5, 18, 25  
 Kennedy, G. A., 147  
 Killen, W. D., 7  
 Kim, C.-H., 119  
 Klauck, H.-J., 49  
 Kleist, J. A., 11, 48, 64, 66, 69, 82, 86, 89, 114, 127, 136, 138, 139, 142, 144, 150, 159, 160, 168, 169  
 Klevinghaus, J., 212  
 Knopf, R., 56, 58  
 Knox, J., 91, 93, 99, 187, 196, 214, 217, 218, 234  
 Koch, D.-A., 174  
 Koester, H., 20, 73, 86, 87, 92, 95, 181, 182, 184, 195, 204, 207, 220, 228, 229, 231  
 Köhler, W.-D., 181, 184, 214  
 Koskenniemi, H., 109  
 Koukouli-Chrysantaki, C., 55, 59  
 Kraft, R. A., 202  
 Kristeva, J., 192  
 Krüger, G., 7, 94  
 Kühner, R., 114  
 Kümmel, W. G., 91, 178, 196, 204  
  
 Laeuchli, S., 167  
 Lake, K., 11, 26, 39, 52, 79, 81, 84, 85, 115, 129, 164, 165, 167, 170, 189, 206, 212, 226  
 Lampakes, 47  
 Lampe, G. W. H., 23  
 Lelong, A., 168  
 Lemcio, E. E., 227  
 Le Moine, É., 4  
 Lieu, J. M., 78  
 Lightfoot, J. B., 6, 7, 15, 17, 20, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 42, 47, 50, 51, 52, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 90, 92, 94, 95, 97, 100, 104, 112, 114, 118, 138, 152, 154, 161, 162, 166, 168, 170, 175, 177, 179, 182, 193, 194, 200, 204, 209, 224  
 Lindemann, A., 49, 69, 98, 126, 132, 136, 160, 162, 190, 196, 198, 205, 207, 212, 213, 220, 221, 222, 224, 226, 227, 230, 232, 233  
 Lipsius, R. A., 5, 23, 41, 71  
 Loewenich, W., 188, 189  
 Lohmann, H., 73  
 Luz, U., 184  
  
 Mackinnon, J., 187  
 Magie, D., 45  
 Maier, H. O., 14, 65, 87, 96, 104, 107, 108, 125, 126, 137, 138, 145  
 Malherbe, A. J., 109, 110, 122, 124, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 140, 178  
 Marrou, H. E., 20  
 Marshall, M. M., 73, 170, 187, 190, 205  
 Massaux, É., 126, 184, 203, 222  
 Maurer, C., 188  
 McNamara, M., 102  
 McNeile, A. H., 39  
 Meinhold, P., 11, 12, 24, 25, 28, 29, 33, 40, 42, 43, 62, 63, 69, 78, 92, 98, 107, 135, 144, 150, 152, 188, 194, 203, 230, 231  
 Michael, J. H., 56  
 Michaels, A., 56  
 Moffatt, J., 56, 112, 139  
 Molland, E., 104  
 Mommsen., 47  
 Moreau, J., 25  
 Moss, J. D., 133



- Muchlenberg, E., 91, 95, 96, 97, 99  
 Müller, H., 19  
 Murray, M. C., 12  
 Musurillo, H., 20  
  
 Nautin, P., 25, 26, 32, 39, 86, 160, 166  
 Newman, J. H., 15  
 Nicholls, R. V., 44  
 Nielsen, C. M., 13, 66, 98, 100, 160, 175,  
     187, 199, 200, 202, 205, 206, 207,  
     220, 226, 234  
 Norden, E., 121  
 Norris, F. W., 15, 42, 84, 219  
  
 Olbrechts-Tyteca, L., 133, 139  
 Orbán, A. P., 31  
 Orgels, P., 23, 24, 27, 30, 36  
 Orr, J., 187, 234  
 Oxford Society of Historical Theology,  
     170, 172, 175, 177, 178, 180, 182,  
     183, 185, 186  
  
 Parkin, T. G., 154  
 Paulsen, H., 11, 69, 86, 132, 136, 160,  
     162, 184  
 Pearson, B. A., 101, 102, 103  
 Pearson, J., 4, 161, 164, 166, 168  
 Perdue, L. G., 78, 124, 125, 126, 130,  
     131  
 Perelman, C., 133, 139  
 Perler, O., 85  
 Peterson, E., 212  
 Pfeleiderer, O., 5, 7, 104  
 Phillips, G. A., 192  
 Pilhofer, P., 56  
 Pollard, T. E., 188  
 Porter, S., 174  
 Potter, D. S., 46  
 Prigent, P., 104  
 Prostmeier, F. R., 67, 69  
 Puech, H.-C., 10, 65, 98, 104, 105, 148,  
     150, 151, 152, 157, 158, 160, 162  
  
 Quasten, J., 33, 57, 150, 151  
 Quinn, J. D., 123, 124  
 Quispel, G., 196, 214, 234  
  
 Rackl, M., 8  
 Ramsay, M., 8  
 Ramsay, W. M., 29, 47, 57, 58, 155  
 Rathke, H., 191, 201  
  
 Reinach, W., 212  
 Renan, E., 26, 66  
 Rensberger, D. K., 151, 217, 218, 222,  
     229, 230, 231, 232  
 Reunig, W., 20, 28, 50  
 Réville, J., 7, 18  
 Richardson, C. C., 104, 160, 198  
 Ritschl, A., 5, 71  
 Rius-Camps, J., 9  
 Robinson, T. A., 46, 104, 219  
 Rordorf, W., 20, 23, 53  
  
 Salmon, G., 18, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32,  
     33, 40, 42, 52, 56, 63, 66, 93, 176,  
     200  
 Sanders, J. N., 186  
 Saxer, V., 21  
 Schaff, P., 26  
 Schlatter, F. W., 75  
 Schmid, U., 216  
 Schmid, W., 25, 29  
 Schmidt, C., 32, 33, 48  
 Schmithals, W., 56, 223, 233  
 Schneemelcher, W., 217, 219  
 Schoedel, W. R., 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18,  
     20, 22, 23, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 41, 50,  
     51, 58, 59, 60, 64, 66, 70, 75, 76, 77,  
     79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 89, 92, 93,  
     95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 102, 104, 105,  
     107, 112, 113, 114, 115, 128, 129,  
     135, 138, 140, 141, 143, 145, 146,  
     150, 152, 153, 155, 156, 160, 162,  
     163, 166, 170, 171, 175, 178, 179,  
     182, 183, 184, 185, 199, 201, 206,  
     207, 212, 224, 226, 229, 238  
 Schöllgen, G., 50  
 Schubert, P., 113  
 Schwartz, E., 26, 28, 33, 62  
 Schwartz, J., 25  
 Schwegler, A., 5, 65, 70  
 Schweizer, E., 224, 226  
 Sellew, P., 223, 224, 228  
 Selwyn, E. G., 200  
 Simonin, H. D., 157  
 Snyder, G. F., 234  
 Souter, A., 224  
 Stambaugh, J. E., 55  
 Stanley, C. E., 174  
 Steinhauser, K. B., 49, 50, 57  
 Steinmetz, P., 12, 71, 73, 74, 95, 103,  
     107, 108, 113, 116, 125, 135, 136,

- Steinmetz (continued)  
     137, 138, 139, 142, 143, 145, 199,  
     200  
 Stowers, S. K., 74, 80, 85, 87, 109, 110,  
     111, 113, 117, 118, 119, 122, 123,  
     124, 127, 128, 129, 132  
 Strecker, G., 217, 218  
 Streeter, B. H., 33, 36, 48, 59, 149, 168,  
     176, 196, 227  
 Strobel, A., 25  
 Stuckwisch, 187  
 Stuibler, A., 20  
 Sundberg, A. C., 39, 211  
 Swete, H. B., 47  
  
 Tabbernee, W., 19  
 Tanner, R. G., 167  
 Telfer, W., 24, 25, 28, 31, 32, 36, 40  
 Tentzelius, W. E., 4, 160  
 Thayer, J. H., 154  
 Thompson, J. D., 15, 229  
 Thompson, M., 173, 174  
 Thurén, L., 133, 146  
 Townsend, J. T., 197, 218  
 Trevett, C., 104, 184  
 Turmel, J., 9, 25, 26  
  
 Turner, C. H., 26, 47, 58  
 Tyson, J. B., 91, 197, 218  
  
 Ussher, J., 5, 17, 67  
  
 Vielhauer, P., 5, 17, 67  
 Volkmar, G., 20  
 Völter, D., 8, 25, 59, 93, 104, 149, 229  
 von der Goltz, E., 7, 188  
  
 Waddington, W. H., 26  
 Wagenmann, J., 217  
 Wake, W., 5, 62, 63, 64, 71, 117, 156,  
     160, 166, 167, 169  
 Walls, A. F., 186  
 Weidmann, F., 17, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40,  
     41, 49, 78  
 Westcott, B. F., 209, 211  
 White, J. L., 116, 118, 119  
 Wieseler, K. G., 25  
 Wilshire, L. E., 218  
 Wilson, J. C., 157, 170  
 Wilson, S. G., 90, 96, 99  
  
 Zahn, T., 6, 51, 67, 68, 69, 79, 82, 85, 92,  
     152, 161, 164, 185, 215, 224

# Index of Passages

## I. Old Testament and Apocrypha

<i>Genesis</i>		150:6	175
4:1-2	102		
<i>Exodus</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
21:18	140	52	192
		52:5	175, 191
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		58:4	140
24:13	205	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
<i>2 Samuel</i>		5:4	175
22:6	185	15:9	205
<i>Psalms</i>		<i>Ezekiel</i>	
4:4	175	16:20-34	139
18:4-6	185	<i>Tobit</i>	
110:1	175	4:10	132, 175, 191
116:3	185	12:9	132, 175, 191

## II. New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		<i>Mark</i>	
3:5	143	1:1	138
3:10	143	9	185
3:15	136	9:35	185
5:3	181, 191, 193	9:43	185
5:10	181, 182, 191, 193	14:38	183, 185
5:44	184, 192	<i>Luke</i>	
5:48	184	2:36-37	32
6:12	182	6:20	182
6:13	183	6:36-38	181, 191
6:38	184	11:4	182
7:1	180	11:50	201
7:1-2	191	16:14	139
7:2	180, 181	20:34	229
12:32	229	<i>John</i>	
13:14-15	182, 183	8:44	14, 15, 102
25:21	180	15:5-8	40
26:41	183, 184, 185		
27:25	201		

*John (continued)*

19:31	23	3:1-2	119
		3:2	226
		4:14	177, 191

*Acts*

2	185	5:3	224
2:5	163	5:5	146
2:24	185	5:10	178
5:28	201	6:7	177
7:52	100, 185	8:1	233
9:2	119	8:1-2	224
10:42	185	8:21	178
13:10	103	10:1	224
16:11	57	10:11	224
16:11-40	56	13:14	119
18:27	119		
19:10	47		
20:6	57		
20:35	185		
21:5	115		
26:18	185		

*Romans*

1:7	112
1:13	116
8:11	191
11:33-36	117
12:1	132
12:2	229
13:8	233
14:10	178
14:10-12	177
15:4	225
16:1-2	119

*1 Corinthians*

1:3	112
4:6	132
5:9	226
6:2	126, 177, 191, 192
6:9-10	191
6:14	191
12:9	222
15:12	105
16:1	233
16:3	119
16:23-24	119

*2 Corinthians*

1:2	112
1:22	146
1:8	116

*Galatians*

1:3	112
1:4	229
1:11	116
4:26	233
6:18	119

*Ephesians*

1:2	112
1:13	146
3:5	139
3:20-21	117
4:26	175, 205
5:5	106
5:21-6:9	117

*Philippians*

1	158
1:1	56, 228
1:1-3:1	223
1:2	112
1:4-11	228
1:12	116
1:14-17	228
1:27	177, 224
2	223
2:1	228
2:3-11	228
2:10	177
2:15-30	228
2:16	163, 177
2:17	177
2:25-30	223
3:1	223, 224
3:1-4	56
3:2	223, 228
3:2-4:1	223

*Philippians (continued)*

3:2-4:3	223	1:8	230
3:2-4:5	227	1:10	229
3:18	177, 192, 193	1:15-16	224
4:1-3	56	2:1-2	192
4:7	228	2:1-3	196
4:4-9	223	2:1-15	117
4:10-20	56, 223, 227	2:2	125, 178, 229
4:15-17	177	2:3	125
4:18	223	2:4-5	125
4:21-23	223	2:6	125
4:23	119	2:9-10	125
		2:12	229
		3:1-7	125
		3:1-13	229
		3:5	178
		3:8	178
		3:8-12	125
		4:6-8	229
		5:1-21	117
		5:3-16	125
		5:5	179
		5:10	122
		5:17-22	229
		5:18	204, 214
		5:24	228
		6	107
		6:1-2	117
		6:1-10	107
		6:3	229
		6:5-6	229
		6:7	52, 178, 179, 231
		6:9-10	106
		6:10	138, 139, 178, 179, 230
		6:11	229
		6:17	229
		6:20	91

*Colossians*

1:2	112
1:23	162
1:27	146
2:5	224
3:5	106, 139
3:17-4:1	117
4:15-16	233

*1 Thessalonians*

1:1	112
1:5	126, 128
2:2	126, 128, 227
2:5	126, 128
2:9	128
2:11	126, 128
2:17	224
3:4	126, 128
3:6	128
4:1	128
4:9	128
4:10	128
5:1	128
5:11	128
5:28	119

*2 Thessalonians*

1:4	178, 226
2:2	112
3:15	178
3:18	119

*1 Timothy*

1:1	146
1:2	112
1:5-9	125
1:6	89, 228
1:7	91

*2 Timothy*

1:2	112
1:18	234
2:1-2	191
2:12	179
2:15	233
2:15-16	179
2:18	233
2:19	201
2:18	106
2:25	179
3:2	139
3:5	229
3:14-17	201

<i>2 Timothy (continued)</i>	
4:1	185
4:3	96, 229
4:10	179, 229
5:18	201

*Titus*

1:1	229
1:9	229
1:4	112
1:9	229
1:10	91, 228
1:11	106
1:14	91, 234
2:1	229
3:4	229
3:9	91

*Philemon*

3	112
25	119

*Hebrews*

5:13	136, 144, 190
6:20	190
7:3	190
12:28	190

*James*

1:26	190
3:2	190

*1 Peter*

1:2	112
1:8	185, 189
1:13	189
1:18	126
1:21	189, 191
2:11	188, 190
2:13-3:7	117
2:12	189, 191

2:17	189
2:21-24	130
2:22	189, 192
2:23	192
2:24	189, 192
3:9	189, 191
4:5	185
4:7	189
5:5	189

*2 Peter*

1:2	112
3:2	209
3:3	96
3:15	190, 224, 225
3:15-16	214

*1 John*

1:1	189
2:18	189
2:22	189
3:8	101, 189
3:12	102, 201
4:2	101
4:2-3	105, 189
4:3	189
5:6-8	90
5:6-9	105

*2 John*

3	112
7	101, 105, 189

*Jude*

11	102
----	-----

*Revelation*

1-4	232
2:8-11	47, 188, 200
2:9	52
3:9	52

## III. Early Christian Literature

*Apostolic Constitutions*

43	48
----	----

*Epistle of Barnabas*

1	158
5.7	68

19.8	122
------	-----

*Basil**Address to Young Men*

10	80
----	----

## 1 Clement

inscr.	112
1	176
1.1	176
1.2	129
1.3	17
4-5	209
5.1-7	163
5.3	163, 219
5.4	163, 176, 219
5.5	143
5.5-7	220
5.6-7	176
5.7	130, 144
9.2-4	164
9-12	164
13	180, 181, 191
13.3	153, 176
16.17	130
17.1	100
21.1	176
21.6-9	117
21.8	122
33.8	130
35.5	138
37.5	176
40.1	193
42.3	209
44.5	162
45.2	176, 193, 206, 209
46-47	212
47	163
47.1	219, 220, 226
47.1-3	226
47.1-4	219
47.2	209
47.2-3	220
53.1	129, 193, 206
55.6	176
60.4	196
62.3	129, 193, 206
64.1	176

## 2 Clement

1.1	185
5.3-4	209, 219

## Clement of Alexandria

*Excerpta ex Theodoto*

24.1	216
47.3	216

50.3	216
62.2	216
66	216

*Qui dives salvetur*

42	39
----	----

*Stromateis*

III.2.1	216
IV.45.4	180
6.34	214
8.17	102

*Didache*

1	202
1.3-4	202
4.9	122
4.9-11	117

*Diognetus, Epistle to*

11.6	209
------	-----

## Epiphanius

*Expositio fidei*

24	23
----	----

*Panarion*

VIII.6.8	23
XXX.24	94

## Eusebius

*Chronicon*

20.222	24
47.205	24

*Historia ecclesiastica*

III.36	40, 41, 43, 50, 77, 78, 156, 157, 167
III.36.13-15	64, 67
III.39	39, 103
III.39.1	39
III.39.16	187
III.39.17	189
IV.7.6-8	49
IV.13	49
IV.13-19	26
IV.14	35, 50
IV.14-15	31
IV.14.6	41
IV.14.8	64, 189
IV.15.1	26
IV.15.30	155
IV.15.47	27
IV.15-25	18
IV.19	26

Eusebius		11.2	152, 153
<i>Historia ecclesiastica (continued)</i>		12.2	59, 220, 226, 233
IV.22	217	15.1	201
IV.22.3	217	18.1	104
IV.26.10	49	21.1	76
IV.29	222	<i>Magnesians</i>	
IV.36.10	49	1.1	146
V.inscr.	24	2	177
V.14	64	3.1	154
V.18	96	6.1	177
V.20	36, 61, 94	6.1–2	56
V.20.8	61, 64	8.1	196
V.20.26	213	8.2	209
V.24	42	9.1	104
V.24.2–7	17, 39, 42	12	201
V.24.4	50	13.1	201, 212
V.24.12–17	42	15	50, 77
V.24–25	78	<i>Philadelphians</i>	
V.27	222	2	105
V.39.4	17	5.1	212
VI.12.3–6	207	5.1–2	100, 203, 209, 210
VI.43.3	224	8.1–2	209
		8.2	212
<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>		9.1–2	100, 209, 210, 212
54	181	10	75
		10.1	82
“Harris Fragments”		10.1–2	82, 83
63r	50	11.1	76
64r + 56v	32	11.2	84
64v + 56r	52	<i>Polycarp</i>	
		inscr.	50, 51
Hermas		1.1	43, 77
<i>Similitudes</i>		1.2	43
8.8–12	106	3.1	142
9.26.2	87	3.2	43, 66, 72, 154, 155
<i>Visions</i>		4.1	177
3.9.4–10	87	4.2	43
		4.3	87
Hippolytus		7.1	75, 154
<i>Refutatio</i>		7.2	82
7	214	7.3	43
8	102	8.1	58, 76, 80, 83
13–14	214	8.2	82, 83
		8.3	21, 52
Ignatius		<i>Romans</i>	
<i>Ephesians</i>		4.1	167
2.1	76	4.1–2	167
3.1	129	4.3	219, 233
5.3	201	5	82
7	104, 177	6.2	152
9	105	6.3	152



Ignatius		III.16.1	97
<i>Romans (continued)</i>		III.17.4	209
7.2	201	IV.30.3	180
7.3	152		
10.2	76	Jerome	
11.2	60	<i>Commentary on Titus</i>	
<i>Smyrnaeans</i>		prol.	222
1-3	104	<i>De viris illustribus</i>	
1-7	105	16	17
1.1	43	17	38, 64, 78, 91, 118
3.2	219	<i>Epistles</i>	
4.3	233	71.5	62
5	104		
5.1	100, 203	Justin	
7.2	100, 203	<i>Apology</i>	
8.1	177	1.26	99
9.1	50	1.48.6-10	49
10.1	76	1.67.3	209
11	75, 76	20.5-6	100
11.1	153	<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>	
11.2	82, 83	49	186
11.2-3	76	100	186
12	84	105	186
12.1	76	199.6	209
12.2	43, 49, 50, 51		
13	60	<i>Laodiceans</i>	
13.2	21, 52	13	227
<i>Trallians</i>			
inscr.	146	<i>Life of Polycarp</i>	
2.2	146	2	33, 47
3.1	177	7	78
6	105	10	50
8.2	175, 191, 201	12	61, 63
9.2	177	19	200
9-11	104	20	45, 62
		21	78
Irenaeus		22	228
<i>Adversus haereses</i>		27	129
I.3	216		
I.8	216	<i>Martyrdom of Pionius</i>	
I.27.2	187	13.1	53
II.35	207		
III.pref.	207	<i>Martyrdom of Polycarp</i>	
III.1.1	207	1.1-2	18
III.2.2	187	2.3	212
III.3	31, 35, 41, 91, 132	4	19, 29, 24
III.3.4	43, 50, 63, 91, 93, 118	4.13	53
III.4	41	6	18
III.4.3	98	7	18
III.12.9	207	6.2-7.1	20
III.13.1	187	8.1	20

*Martyrdom of Polycarp (continued)*

9	200		200, 234
9.1-2	20	1.1	70, 71, 81, 113, 115, 152, 176, 177
12-13	52		
12.2	28, 78	1.1-2	5, 131
14	21	1.1-3	134
15.1	18	1.2	114, 115, 176, 184
16.1	19, 20	1.3	13, 126, 177, 180, 189, 191
16.1-2	18		
16.2	50	1.3-2.1	190
17-18	20, 21, 53	2	72, 89, 116, 117, 127, 131, 142, 145
17.2-3	20		
17.3	18	2.1	72, 97, 104, 134, 175, 177, 185, 189, 201, 228
18.2	18		
18.3	21	2.1-2	191
19.1	18, 21, 31	2.1-3	133, 191
20	27, 167, 169, 238	2.2	13, 72, 86, 116, 138, 140, 177, 189, 191
21	19, 20, 22, 25, 28, 30		
22	20	2.2-3	134, 140, 144, 191
22.2-3	19	2.3	87, 114, 126, 131, 135, 136, 142, 180, 181, 185, 193
epilogue	24, 36, 50		
<i>Muratorian Canon</i>		3	5, 12, 72, 116, 127, 162, 200, 210, 223, 227
10	39		
<i>Nag Hammadi Codices</i>		3.1	1, 81, 86, 123, 129, 134, 135, 136, 137, 144, 145, 146, 231
II.4	102		
II.10.34	102	3.1-3	134, 220
III.58.15	103	3.2	126, 128, 134, 138, 144, 176, 179, 190, 194, 202, 206, 219, 230, 233, 237
Origen			
<i>Commentary on Romans</i>		3.2-3	146, 190, 2332
5.1	216	3.2-4.1	233
<i>Contra Celsum</i>		3.3	136, 141, 144, 228
3.13	102	4	5, 128, 230
Philostratus		4-6	72, 125
<i>Liber de haereses</i>		4.1	126, 132, 135, 138, 140, 146, 177, 178, 179, 185, 191, 231
17.7	91		
Photius		4.1-2	122
<i>Bibliotheca</i>		4.1-6.1	117, 230
126	64, 157	4.2	51, 52, 98
232	217	4.2-3	176
		4.2-6.2	190
Polycarp		4.3	72, 133, 138, 179, 182, 191
<i>Philippians</i>			
praesc.	111, 112	4.3-5.2	116, 134
1	8, 9, 71, 113, 114, 115, 149, 158, 176, 231, 238	5	185, 231
		5.1	126, 132, 133, 190 191
1-12	10, 78, 136, 144, 149,	5.1-6.1	128

Polycarp	10	68, 128, 130, 191
<i>Philippians (continued)</i>	10.1	82, 131, 133, 189
5.2	10.1-2	143
56, 114, 131, 133, 134,	10.2	87, 131, 134, 139, 175,
135, 138, 146, 176,		189
177, 178, 179, 185,	10.2-3	133
186, 228	10.3	107, 131, 132, 175
5.2-3	11	5, 6, 68, 72, 86, 87,
5.3		128, 141, 225
71, 72, 96, 131, 132,	11.1	86, 106, 107, 108, 113,
176, 177, 185, 189,		131, 132, 138, 139
190, 191	11.1-2	72
6	11.1-4	108, 137
101, 231	11.2	82, 126, 133, 139, 175,
6.1		177, 191, 193, 206, 219
72, 106, 126, 139, 141,	11.2-3	107, 206
175, 177, 178, 182,	11.2-12.1	233
183, 190, 191	11.3	15, 56, 79, 80, 126,
6.1-2		131, 134, 178, 219,
6.1-7.2		220, 227
108	11.4	86, 108, 131, 133, 134,
6.2		141, 176
126, 132, 133, 141,	11.4-12.1	141
177, 178, 180, 182,	12	68, 72, 117, 128, 156,
183, 191, 219		159, 160, 162, 203, 205
6.2-7.2	12.1	14, 100, 126, 129, 131,
128		132, 134, 138, 175,
6.3		204, 205, 206, 208, 237
12, 100, 126, 132, 134,	12.2	142, 144, 175, 185, 190
177, 185, 190, 203,	12.3	131, 133, 177, 178,
209, 212		180, 184, 192, 193
6.3-7.2	13	4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 64, 68,
89		71, 72, 80, 116, 117,
7		118, 128, 144, 148,
72, 89, 95, 97, 101,		149, 150, 153, 154,
104, 105, 150, 151, 237		155, 156, 157, 160,
7.1		161, 162, 163, 164,
14, 96, 99, 102, 126,		166, 169, 210, 238
180, 189	13.1	69, 70, 76, 81, 82, 154,
7.2		155, 165
72, 82, 97, 103, 126,	13-14	152, 158
132, 176, 180, 183,	13.1-2	134
185, 189	13.2	69, 70, 77, 84, 144,
8		148, 166, 176
130, 143, 192	14	10, 11, 68, 72, 79, 80,
8-9		118, 119, 128, 149,
128		150, 153, 159, 160, 238
8-10	14.1	84
72, 130		
8.1		
135, 146, 189, 232		
8.1-2		
132		
8.1-9.2		
134		
8.2		
133		
9		
4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 64, 68,		
71, 115, 118, 130, 149,		
150, 156, 157, 160,		
161, 162, 163, 166,		
169, 238		
9.1		
70, 72, 81, 126, 130,		
132, 135, 136, 144,		
146, 148, 162, 190,		
206, 219, 220		
9.1-2		
134, 143, 146, 220		
9.1-10.1		
233		
9.2		
68, 135, 162, 176, 177,		
179, 191		

*Protoevangelium of James*

13.1 102

Pseudo-Clement		III.5	217
<i>Homily</i>		III.8	94
III.25.1–2	102	IV.15.2	39
14.2	209	V.17	225
		V.21	234
Pseudo-Ignatius		<i>De carne Christi</i>	
<i>Philadelphians</i>		5.1	97
6.1	103	<i>De praescriptione haereticorum</i>	
<i>Trallians</i>		20	95
10–11	103	32	50
		32.2	38
Pseudo-Tertullian		33	102
<i>Haereses</i>		38	95
2	102		
Tertullian		Valentinus	
<i>Adversus Marcionem</i>		<i>Evangelius Veritatis</i>	
1.19	98	45.24	216

## IV. Other Ancient Writings

Aristotle		XII.3.4	46
<i>Physics</i>		XVI.2.3–5	46
218a 9	79	XVI.6.1–6	46
<i>Rhetoric</i>			
1.3	122	Philo	
		<i>De migratione Abrahami</i>	
2 <i>Baruch</i>		74	102
78.2	112	<i>Quod deterius</i>	
		1	102
Cicero		32	102
<i>Letter to His Friends</i>			
14.2	110	Philostratus	
<i>On the Orator</i>		<i>Vitae Sophistarum</i>	
2.64	122	535	46
Dio Chrysostom			
<i>Oration 17</i>		Plato	
2	131	<i>Alcibiades</i>	
16	130	130E	79
Isocrates		<i>Meno</i>	
<i>Ad Demonium</i>		89C	79
1.7	122		
5	122	Pliny	
8	130	<i>Letters</i>	
Josephus		X.96.4	81
<i>Antiquities</i>		X.96–97	58
XII.3.2	46	<i>P. Oxy.</i>	
		32	79, 109

*P. Oxy. (continued)*

1162	119
3067	110

*Pseudo-Cicero*

<i>Letter to Herennius</i>	
3.4.7	122

*Pseudo-Isocrates*

<i>Ad Nicoclem</i>	
40–41	126

*Quintillian*

<i>Education of the Orator</i>	
3.4.2–16	122
3.7.29	122

*Seneca*

<i>Epistle 75</i>	
1	110

*Epistle 94*

1	127
21–26	127
32–35	133

*Epistle 95*

21–25	130
-------	-----

*Epistle 6*

5	130
---	-----

*Epistle 102*

25	179
----	-----

*Sibylline Oracles*

V.122	47
V.306	47

*Strabo**Geographica*

XIV.1.37	45
----------	----

*Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*

Gen. 4:1–2	102
------------	-----

## Index of Subjects

- Acts, 185, 189, 194, 195, 196, 197, 213,  
216, 217, 218, 232, 236, 238  
*Acts of John*, 39, 41  
Advice, 122, 123, 124, 137  
Alce, 21, 52  
Allusions, criteria of, 170-174  
Anicetus, 26, 30, 35, 41, 42, 77, 91  
Antichrist, 102, 189  
Antioch, 75, 76, 84, 116  
– church of, 82, 83, 88, 156  
Antoninus Pius, 6, 28, 31, 49  
Apostles, 126, 130, 143, 146, 163, 164,  
203, 207, 208, 209, 212, 214, 215  
Apostolic succession, 15, 36, 40, 41, 51,  
58  
Avarice (greed, covetousness), 13, 14, 64,  
72, 86, 87, 106, 107, 108, 116, 125,  
132, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140,  
141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 179,  
193, 230, 234, 237, 238  
  
*Barnabas, Epistle of*, 68, 158, 160, 185,  
195, 214, 216  
Bishop (episcopacy), 4, 8, 9, 15, 39, 40,  
41, 48, 49, 50, 51, 56, 57, 112, 219  
Bucolis, 34, 40, 49, 92  
Burrhus, 76, 84, 115  
  
Cain, 14, 102, 201  
Callisto, 34  
Catechetical and confessional material,  
181, 200, 201  
“Catholic” church, 1, 7, 9, 15, 20, 213,  
216, 217, 221, 236  
Cerdo, 98, 99  
Cerinthus (Cerinthianism), 35, 41, 93, 94,  
104  
Chiliasm, 39, 188  
*1 Clement*, 12, 112, 127, 138, 176, 184,  
186, 190, 194, 199, 203, 209, 210,  
211, 216, 219, 222, 232, 236, 237  
Confessional sources, 201  
  
*Corpus Polycarpianum*, 33, 63  
Crescens, 72, 79, 80, 84, 118, 128, 159  
  
Deacon, 9, 49, 116, 125, 139, 147, 178  
*Didache*, 158, 183, 184, 201, 202, 216  
*Diognetus, Epistle to*, 122, 149, 151, 202  
Docetism, 36, 95, 99, 104, 105, 107, 108,  
193, 228  
  
Elder (presbyter), 9, 41, 48, 49, 50, 51,  
56, 125, 139, 141, 147, 237  
Endurance, 72, 128, 130, 131, 137, 138,  
142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148,  
161, 164, 192, 238  
Ephesus, 35, 36, 41, 45, 47, 227, 233  
Epistolary criticism, 2, 16, 109-120, 152,  
158, 160, 161, 169, 236, 237, 238, 239  
– commendation, 118-119, 131  
– joy expression, 13, 112-115  
– letter body, 116-118  
– letter opening, 50, 111-116, 130, 155,  
160, 237, 238  
– letter closing, 118-120, 152, 160, 237,  
238  
– *praescriptio*, 111  
Eschatology, 13, 73, 117, 193, 199  
Ethics (morality), 13, 72, 86, 108, 122,  
135, 144-145, 199, 228  
  
“Firstborn of Satan,” 14, 35, 89, 90, 91,  
93, 94, 96, 97, 101, 102, 103  
Florinus, 37, 38, 61  
Forgiving (forgiveness), 72, 131, 137,  
138, 139-142, 145, 146, 147, 182, 192  
Form criticism, 92, 115, 164, 169, 225  
– Chreia, 92, 94, 132, 237  
– Disavowals, 128, 129, 205, 206, 237  
– *Paradeigmata*, 128, 129, 130, 147,  
163, 238  
  
Gnosticism, 5, 99, 102, 103, 104, 144,  
188, 211, 214, 216, 221, 222, 223,

- Gnosticism (continued)  
 228, 229, 231, 234
- Gospel (gospels, four-fold Gospel), 12,  
 100, 187, 203, 209, 212, 214, 225,  
 226, 235
- "Great Sabbath," 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30
- "Harris fragments," 17, 32, 40, 41, 52,  
 153
- Harrison's conflation theory, 9, 10, 11,  
 12, 14, 80, 149-164, 169, 222, 238
- Heresy (heretics), 6, 12, 13, 14, 35, 57,  
 61, 72, 89-108, 128, 135, 136, 144-  
 145, 193, 222, 229, 238
- Hermas, Shepherd of*, 87, 106, 158, 216
- Household and community codes  
 (*Haus tafeln, Gemeindetafeln*), 108,  
 117, 125, 128, 139, 146, 147, 190,  
 230, 236
- Ignatian collection, 4, 8, 9, 15, 25, 64, 68,  
 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 77, 81, 82, 84-  
 85, 88, 91, 104, 118, 128, 148, 149,  
 150, 153, 155, 210, 232
- Ignatius, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 25, 43, 71, 73,  
 74, 76, 83, 93, 99, 114, 115, 118, 134,  
 143, 146, 148, 149, 152, 153, 156,  
 157, 158, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165,  
 166, 167, 184, 187, 194, 196, 201,  
 203, 208, 210, 211, 212, 216, 219,  
 222, 226, 238
- martyrdom of, 4, 5, 58, 59, 60, 74, 85,  
 149, 156, 157, 165, 166, 167, 168
- trip of, 10, 44, 57-60, 74, 75, 76, 77,  
 78, 80, 81, 82, 84, 88, 115, 116, 130,  
 137, 154, 155, 164, 165, 166, 167,  
 170, 238
- Intertextuality, 192, 193, 199, 238
- Irenaeus, 7, 17, 35-41, 42, 43, 61, 90-94,  
 156, 166, 187, 208, 214, 237
- Jesus material (oral tradition), 95, 96,  
 101, 103, 126, 145, 180, 181, 183,  
 184, 185, 186, 187
- Jews (Jewish), 7, 23, 30, 46, 47, 52, 53,  
 55, 104, 200, 201, 202, 212, 237
- John, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 48, 92, 93,  
 94, 187, 188, 217, 225
- 1 John, 188, 189, 194, 195, 196, 238
- Judgment, 13, 89, 90, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100,  
 101, 102, 197, 116, 141, 191
- Justin, 26, 99, 100, 185, 186, 187, 209,  
 216, 217
- "Knowing that," 126, 182, 191, 230, 231
- Laodiceans, Epistle to the*, 227, 228
- Life of Polycarp*, 17, 32-34, 36, 62, 63
- "Lord's prayer," 180, 183, 184
- Lyons and Vienne, 24, 26, 27, 35
- Marcion (Marcionitism), 1, 7, 10, 11, 12,  
 13, 14, 35, 43, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95,  
 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104,  
 135, 136, 151, 159, 168, 187, 194,  
 196, 199, 202-203, 204, 211, 213, 214,  
 215, 216, 217, 218, 222, 228, 234,  
 236, 237
- Marcus Aurelius, 6, 8, 25, 26, 54
- Martyrdom of Polycarp*, 17, 18-22
- Martyrs, cult of the, 18, 19, 20, 21, 52, 53
- Melito of Sardis, 49
- Montanism, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 96, 104,  
 207
- Moral exhortation, 121-128
- Muratorian Canon*, 39, 209, 225, 233
- New Testament (New Testament canon),  
 1, 15, 90, 100, 101, 158, 172, 208-215,  
 236, 239
- Old Testament, 1, 14, 90, 98, 99, 101,  
 142, 174-175, 194, 199-202, 203, 205,  
 209, 211, 212, 236, 237
- Papias, 17, 38, 43, 62, 92, 103, 185, 186,  
 187, 188
- Paraenesis, 14, 65, 74, 78, 106, 107, 121-  
 134, 131, 135, 163, 194, 200, 202,  
 203, 210, 237, 238
- Pastoral Epistles, 1, 5, 12, 14, 63, 91,  
 106, 147, 178, 179, 195, 196, 228-231,  
 233, 234, 236, 237
- Paul, 1, 7, 11, 14, 33, 35, 36, 48, 56, 90,  
 101, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 134,  
 138, 143, 146, 163, 164, 201, 203,  
 206, 207, 213, 214, 216-235, 236, 238
- Pauline collection, 1, 85, 214, 227, 232-  
 235, 236
- Peter, 7, 58, 163, 164, 206, 207, 217, 219
- 1 Peter, 64, 189, 195, 196, 200, 203, 220,  
 238

- Philip of Tralles, 27, 284  
 Philippi, 44, 53-55, 74, 103, 150, 165, 212  
 – church of, 12, 44, 56-57, 78-84, 87, 137, 147, 157, 168, 199, 200, 202, 206, 210, 220, 222, 238  
 Philippians, 1, 56, 177, 201, 223-228, 236  
*Philippians*, Polycarp's *Epistle to the*,  
 – authenticity, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 69-72, 114, 118, 237  
 – background, 2, 12, 16, 236  
 – contents, 3, 5, 12, 63, 72-73, 127  
 – dating, 5, 11, 12, 104, 152, 169, 178, 195, 234, 238  
 – external attestation, 7, 160  
 – interpolations, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 70, 71, 72, 113, 114, 117, 118, 148, 149, 204  
 – Latin translation, 69, 78, 110, 127, 129, 161, 162, 169, 204, 207, 225, 226  
 – purpose, 5, 12, 16, 198  
 – style, 1, 3, 12, 14, 65-67, 126, 147, 198-199, 236  
 – textual criticism, 10, 12, 67-69  
 – theme, 2, 16, 135-138, 169, 199, 236, 239  
 – theology, 72, 117, 135, 144, 145, 202, 231  
 – unity, 2, 4, 10, 11, 12, 80, 148-169, 195, 236, 237, 238, 239  
 Philo and Rheus Agathopous, 76  
 Philomelium, church of, 18, 27, 28, 167, 168  
 Pliny, 58, 81  
 Pionius, 26, 30, 32, 33, 53  
 Polycarp  
 – life of, 12, 17-43  
 – martyrdom of, 18-32, 154, 238  
 – personality of, 65, 66, 145, 172  
 “Poring over,” 194, 206, 237  
 Polycrates, 36, 39, 42, 78  
 Prophets, 100, 203, 207, 209, 211, 212  
 Protrepsis, 122  
 Quartodecismism, 23, 33, 36, 39, 41, 42, 43, 48, 91, 188  
 Quintus, 20, 21, 24, 168  
 Resurrection, 13, 89, 90, 95, 96, 97, 101, 105, 107, 140, 142, 186, 212  
 Rhetorical criticism (rhetoric), 2, 12, 16, 121-134, 141, 146, 147, 198, 199, 206, 211, 227, 236, 239  
 – ethos, 132-134  
 – *exordium*, 116, 117, 145  
 – pathos, 132-134  
 – *peroratio*, 142  
 Righteousness, 1, 12, 51, 72, 74, 81, 86-87, 88, 107, 108, 116, 117, 127, 128, 130, 131, 135-147, 148, 161, 164, 192, 194, 221, 231-232, 236, 237, 238  
 Rome (Roman Church), 32, 42, 50, 91, 92, 98, 99, 100, 165, 167, 168, 169, 214, 217, 219, 235  
 Rule of faith, 211, 212  
 Scripture, 1, 14, 101, 117, 126, 128, 129, 138, 142, 144, 191, 194, 203-207, 208, 210, 213, 215, 236, 237  
 Sermon on the Mount, 180, 202, 203  
 Synoptic Gospels, 180-186  
 Smyrna, 12, 21, 35, 36, 44-47, 57, 58, 85, 92, 165, 197, 200, 234, 235  
 – church of, 41, 44, 47-53, 167, 168  
 Statius Quadratus, 27, 29, 31  
 Stratias, 36, 48  
 Trajan, 8, 54, 58, 59, 60, 75, 151, 169  
 Valens, 12, 14, 72, 81, 86, 87, 88, 89, 95, 98, 106, 107, 108, 116, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 182, 199, 200, 210, 221  
 Valentinus (Valentinians), 35, 43, 95, 187, 193, 214, 216  
 Victor, 42  
 Widows, 116, 125, 139, 141  
 Zosimus and Rufus, 8, 81, 82, 115, 130, 143, 148, 156, 162





# Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

## *Alphabetical Index of the First and Second Series*

- Ådna, Jostein*: Jesu Stellung zum Tempel. 2000. *Volume II/119*.
- Ådna, Jostein and Kvalbein, Hans* (Ed.): The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles. 2000. *Volume 127*.
- Alkier, Stefan*: Wunder und Wirklichkeit in den Briefen des Apostels Paulus. 2001. *Volume 134*.
- Anderson, Paul N.*: The Christology of the Fourth Gospel. 1996. *Volume II/78*.
- Appold, Mark L.*: The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel. 1976. *Volume II/1*.
- Arnold, Clinton E.*: The Colossian Syncretism. 1995. *Volume II/77*.
- Asiedu-Pepurah, Martin*: Johannine Sabbath Conflicts As Juridical Controversy. 2001. *Volume II/132*.
- Avemarie, Friedrich and Hermann Lichtenberger* (Ed.): Auferstehung – Resurrection. 2001. *Volume 135*.
- Avemarie, Friedrich and Hermann Lichtenberger* (Ed.): Bund und Tora. 1996. *Volume 92*.
- Bachmann, Michael*: Sünder oder Übertreter. 1992. *Volume 59*.
- Baker, William R.*: Personal Speech-Ethics in the Epistle of James. 1995. *Volume II/68*.
- Bakke, Odd Magne*: 'Concord and Peace'. 2001. *Volume II/143*.
- Balla, Peter*: Challenges to New Testament Theology. 1997. *Volume II/95*.
- Bammel, Ernst*: Judaica. *Volume I* 1986. *Volume 37*  
– *Volume II* 1997. *Volume 91*.
- Bash, Anthony*: Ambassadors for Christ. 1997. *Volume II/92*.
- Bauernfeind, Otto*: Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte. 1980. *Volume 22*.
- Baum, Armin Daniel*: Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im frühen Christentum. 2001. *Volume II/138*.
- Bayer, Hans Friedrich*: Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection. 1986. *Volume II/20*.
- Bell, Richard H.*: Provoked to Jealousy. 1994. *Volume II/63*.  
– No One Seeks for God. 1998. *Volume 106*.
- Bennema, Cornelis*: The Power of Saving Wisdom. 2002. *Volume II/148*.
- Bergman, Jan*: see Kieffer, René
- Bergmeier, Roland*: Das Gesetz im Römerbrief und andere Studien zum Neuen Testament. 2000. *Volume 121*.
- Betz, Otto*: Jesus, der Messias Israels. 1987. *Volume 42*.  
– Jesus, der Herr der Kirche. 1990. *Volume 52*.
- Beyschlag, Karlmann*: Simon Magus und die christliche Gnosis. 1974. *Volume 16*.
- Bittner, Wolfgang J.*: Jesu Zeichen im Johannes-evangelium. 1987. *Volume II/26*.
- Bjerkelund, Carl J.*: Tauta Egeneto. 1987. *Volume 40*.
- Blackburn, Barry Lee*: Theios Anēr and the Markan Miracle Traditions. 1991. *Volume II/40*.
- Bock, Darrell L.*: Blasphemy and Exaltation in Judaism and the Final Examination of Jesus. 1998. *Volume II/106*.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N.A.*: Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity. 1990. *Volume II/36*.
- Bøe, Sverre*: Gog and Magog. 2001. *Volume II/135*.
- Böhlig, Alexander*: Gnosis und Synkretismus. Teil 1 1989. *Volume 47* – Teil 2 1989. *Volume 48*.
- Böhm, Martina*: Samaritanen und die Samaritaner bei Lukas. 1999. *Volume II/111*.
- Böttlich, Christfried*: Weltweisheit – Menschheitsethik – Urkult. 1992. *Volume II/50*.
- Bolyki, János*: Jesu Tischgemeinschaften. 1997. *Volume II/96*.
- Brocke, Christoph vom*: Thessaloniki – Stadt des Kassander und Gemeinde des Paulus. 2001. *Volume II/125*.
- Büchli, Jörg*: Der Poimandres – ein paganisiertes Evangelium. 1987. *Volume II/27*.
- Bühner, Jan A.*: Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium. 1977. *Volume II/2*.
- Burchard, Christoph*: Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth. 1965. *Volume 8*.  
– Studien zur Theologie, Sprache und Umwelt des Neuen Testaments. Ed. von D. Sänger. 1998. *Volume 107*.
- Burnett, Richard*: Karl Barth's Theological Exegesis. 2001. *Volume II/145*.
- Byrskog, Samuel*: Story as History – History as Story. 2000. *Volume 123*.
- Cancik, Hubert* (Ed.): Markus-Philologie. 1984. *Volume 33*.

- Capes, David B.*: Old Testament Yaweh Texts in Paul's Christology. 1992. *Volume II/47*.
- Caragounis, Chrys C.*: The Son of Man. 1986. *Volume 38*.
- see *Fridrichsen, Anton*.
- Carleton Paget, James*: The Epistle of Barnabas. 1994. *Volume II/64*.
- Carson, D.A., O'Brien, Peter T. and Mark Seifrid* (Ed.): Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism. Volume 1: The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism. *Volume II/140*.
- Ciampa, Roy E.*: The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2. 1998. *Volume II/102*.
- Classen, Carl Joachim*: Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament. 2000. *Volume 128*.
- Crump, David*: Jesus the Intercessor. 1992. *Volume II/49*.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup*: Studies in Ephesians. 2000. *Volume 131*.
- Deines, Roland*: Jüdische Steingefäße und pharisäische Frömmigkeit. 1993. *Volume II/52*.
- Die Pharisäer. 1997. *Volume 101*.
- Dietzfelbinger, Christian*: Der Abschied des Kommenden. 1997. *Volume 95*.
- Dobbeler, Axel von*: Glaube als Teilhabe. 1987. *Volume II/22*.
- Du Toit, David S.*: Theios Anthropos. 1997. *Volume II/91*.
- Dunn, James D.G.* (Ed.): Jews and Christians. 1992. *Volume 66*.
- Paul and the Mosaic Law. 1996. *Volume 89*.
- Dunn, James D.G., Hans Klein, Ulrich Luz and Vasile Mihoc* (Ed.): Auslegung der Bibel in orthodoxer und westlicher Perspektive. 2000. *Volume 130*.
- Ebertz, Michael N.*: Das Charisma des Gekreuzigten. 1987. *Volume 45*.
- Eckstein, Hans-Joachim*: Der Begriff Synecdoche bei Paulus. 1983. *Volume II/10*.
- Verheißung und Gesetz. 1996. *Volume 86*.
- Ego, Beate*: Im Himmel wie auf Erden. 1989. *Volume II/34*.
- Ego, Beate and Lange, Armin with Pilhofer, Peter* (Ed.): Gemeinde ohne Tempel – Community without Temple. 1999. *Volume 118*.
- Eisen, Ute E.*: see *Paulsen, Henning*.
- Ellis, E. Earle*: Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity. 1978. *Volume 18*.
- The Old Testament in Early Christianity. 1991. *Volume 54*.
- Ennulat, Andreas*: Die 'Minor Agreements'. 1994. *Volume II/62*.
- Ensor, Peter W.*: Jesus and His 'Works'. 1996. *Volume II/85*.
- Eskola, Timo*: Messiah and the Throne. 2001. *Volume II/142*.
- Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology. 1998. *Volume II/100*.
- Fatehi, Mehrdad*: The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul. 2000. *Volume II/128*.
- Feldmeier, Reinhard*: Die Krisis des Gottessohnes. 1987. *Volume II/21*.
- Die Christen als Fremde. 1992. *Volume 64*.
- Feldmeier, Reinhard and Ulrich Heckel* (Ed.): Die Heiden. 1994. *Volume 70*.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H.T.*: Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology. 1997. *Volume II/94*.
- Förster, Niclas*: Marcus Magus. 1999. *Volume 114*.
- Forbes, Christopher Brian*: Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment. 1995. *Volume II/75*.
- Fornberg, Tord*: see *Fridrichsen, Anton*.
- Fossum, Jarl E.*: The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. 1985. *Volume 36*.
- Frenschkowski, Marco*: Offenbarung und Epiphanie. Volume 1 1995. *Volume II/79* – Volume 2 1997. *Volume II/80*.
- Frey, Jörg*: Eugen Drewermann und die biblische Exegese. 1995. *Volume II/71*.
- Die johanneische Eschatologie. Volume I. 1997. *Volume 96*. – Volume II. 1998. *Volume 110*.
- Volume III. 2000. *Volume 117*.
- Freyne, Sean*: Galilee and Gospel. 2000. *Volume 125*.
- Fridrichsen, Anton*: Exegetical Writings. Edited by C.C. Caragounis and T. Fornberg. 1994. *Volume 76*.
- Garlington, Don B.*: 'The Obedience of Faith'. 1991. *Volume II/38*.
- Faith, Obedience, and Perseverance. 1994. *Volume 79*.
- Garnet, Paul*: Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls. 1977. *Volume II/3*.
- Gese, Michael*: Das Vermächtnis des Apostels. 1997. *Volume II/99*.
- Gräbe, Petrus J.*: The Power of God in Paul's Letters. 2000. *Volume II/123*.
- Gräßer, Erich*: Der Alte Bund im Neuen. 1985. *Volume 35*.
- Forschungen zur Apostelgeschichte. 2001. *Volume 137*.
- Green, Joel B.*: The Death of Jesus. 1988. *Volume II/33*.
- Gundry Volf, Judith M.*: Paul and Perseverance. 1990. *Volume II/37*.
- Hafemann, Scott J.*: Suffering and the Spirit. 1986. *Volume II/19*.

- Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel. 1995. *Volume 81.*
- Hannah, Darrel D.:* Michael and Christ. 1999. *Volume II/109.*
- Hamid-Khani, Saeed:* Revelation and Concealment of Christ. 2000. *Volume II/120.*
- Hartman, Lars:* Text-Centered New Testament Studies. Ed. von D. Hellholm. 1997. *Volume 102.*
- Hartog, Paul:* Polycarp and the New Testament. 2001. *Volume II/134.*
- Heckel, Theo K.:* Der Innere Mensch. 1993. *Volume II/53.*
- Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium. 1999. *Volume 120.*
- Heckel, Ulrich:* Kraft in Schwachheit. 1993. *Volume II/56.*
- see *Feldmeier, Reinhard.*
- see *Hengel, Martin.*
- Heiligenthal, Roman:* Werke als Zeichen. 1983. *Volume II/9.*
- Hellholm, D.:* see *Hartman, Lars.*
- Hemer, Colin J.:* The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History. 1989. *Volume 49.*
- Hengel, Martin:* Judentum und Hellenismus. 1969, <sup>3</sup>1988. *Volume 10.*
- Die johanneische Frage. 1993. *Volume 67.*
- *Judaica et Hellenistica.* Volume 1. 1996. *Volume 90.*
- Volume 2. 1999. *Volume 109.*
- Hengel, Martin and Ulrich Heckel (Ed.):* Paulus und das antike Judentum. 1991. *Volume 58.*
- Hengel, Martin and Hermut Löhr (Ed.):* Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum. 1994. *Volume 73.*
- Hengel, Martin and Anna Maria Schwemer:* Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien. 1998. *Volume 108.*
- Der messianische Anspruch Jesu und die Anfänge der Christologie. 2001. *Volume 138.*
- Hengel, Martin and Anna Maria Schwemer (Ed.):* Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult. 1991. *Volume 55.*
- Die Septuaginta. 1994. *Volume 72.*
- Hengel, Martin, Siegfried Mittmann and Anna Maria Schwemer (Ed.):* La Cité de Dieu / Die Stadt Gottes. 2000. *Volume 129.*
- Herrenbrück, Fritz:* Jesus und die Zöllner. 1990. *Volume II/41.*
- Herzer, Jens:* Paulus oder Petrus? 1998. *Volume 103.*
- Hoegen-Rohls, Christina:* Der nachösterliche Johannes. 1996. *Volume II/84.*
- Hofius, Otfried:* Katapausis. 1970. *Volume 11.*
- Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes. 1972. *Volume 14.*
- Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6-11. 1976, <sup>2</sup>1991. *Volume 17.*
- Paulusstudien. 1989, <sup>2</sup>1994. *Volume 51.*
- Neutestamentliche Studien. 2000. *Volume 132.*
- Hofius, Otfried and Hans-Christian Kammler:* Johannesstudien. 1996. *Volume 88.*
- Holtz, Traugott:* Geschichte und Theologie des Urchristentums. 1991. *Volume 57.*
- Hommel, Hildebrecht:* Sebasmata. Volume 1 1983. *Volume 31 – Volume 2 1984. Volume 32.*
- Hvalvik, Reidar:* The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant. 1996. *Volume II/82.*
- Joubert, Stephan:* Paul as Benefactor. 2000. *Volume II/124.*
- Kähler, Christoph:* Jesu Gleichnisse als Poesie und Therapie. 1995. *Volume 78.*
- Kamlah, Ehrhard:* Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament. 1964. *Volume 7.*
- Kammler, Hans-Christian:* Christologie und Eschatologie. 2000. *Volume 126.*
- see *Hofius, Otfried.*
- Kelhoffer, James A.:* Miracle and Mission. 1999. *Volume II/112.*
- Kieffer, René and Jan Bergman (Ed.):* La Main de Dieu / Die Hand Gottes. 1997. *Volume 94.*
- Kim, Seyoon:* The Origin of Paul's Gospel. 1981, <sup>2</sup>1984. *Volume II/4.*
- „The 'Son of Man'“ as the Son of God. 1983. *Volume 30.*
- Klein, Hans:* see *Dunn, James D.G..*
- Kleinknecht, Karl Th.:* Der leidende Gerechtfertigte. 1984, <sup>2</sup>1988. *Volume II/13.*
- Klinghardt, Matthias:* Gesetz und Volk Gottes. 1988. *Volume II/32.*
- Köhler, Wolf-Dietrich:* Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums in der Zeit vor Irenäus. 1987. *Volume II/24.*
- Korn, Manfred:* Die Geschichte Jesu in veränderter Zeit. 1993. *Volume II/51.*
- Koskenniemi, Erkki:* Apollonios von Tyana in der neutestamentlichen Exegese. 1994. *Volume II/61.*
- Kraus, Thomas J.:* Sprache, Stil und historischer Ort des zweiten Petrusbriefes. 2001. *Volume II/136.*
- Kraus, Wolfgang:* Das Volk Gottes. 1996. *Volume 85.*
- see *Walter, Nikolaus.*
- Kreplin, Matthias:* Das Selbstverständnis Jesu. 2001. *Volume II/141.*
- Kuhn, Karl G.:* Achtzehn Gebet und Vaterunser und der Reim. 1950. *Volume 1.*
- Kvalbein, Hans:* see *Ådna, Jostein.*
- Laansma, Jon:* I Will Give You Rest. 1997. *Volume II/98.*
- Labahn, Michael:* Offenbarung in Zeichen und Wort. 2000. *Volume II/117.*

- Lange, Armin*: see *Ego, Beate*.
- Lampe, Peter*: Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten. 1987, <sup>2</sup>1989. *Volume II/18*.
- Landmesser, Christof*: Wahrheit als Grundbegriff neutestamentlicher Wissenschaft. 1999. *Volume II/3*.
- Jüngerberufung und Zuwendung zu Gott. 2000. *Volume II/33*.
- Lau, Andrew*: Manifest in Flesh. 1996. *Volume II/86*.
- Lee, Pilchan*: The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation. 2000. *Volume II/129*.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann*: see *Avemarie, Friedrich*.
- Lieu, Samuel N. C.*: Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China. <sup>2</sup>1992. *Volume II/63*.
- Loader, William R. G.*: Jesus' Attitude Towards the Law. 1997. *Volume II/97*.
- Löhr, Gebhard*: Verherrlichung Gottes durch Philosophie. 1997. *Volume II/97*.
- Löhr, Hermut*: see *Hengel, Martin*.
- Löhr, Winrich Alfried*: Basilides und seine Schule. 1995. *Volume II/83*.
- Luomanen, Petri*: Entering the Kingdom of Heaven. 1998. *Volume II/101*.
- Luz, Ulrich*: see *Dunn, James D. G.*.
- Maier, Gerhard*: Mensch und freier Wille. 1971. *Volume II/12*.
- Die Johannesoffenbarung und die Kirche. 1981. *Volume II/25*.
- Markschies, Christoph*: Valentinus Gnosticus? 1992. *Volume II/65*.
- Marshall, Peter*: Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians. 1987. *Volume II/23*.
- McDonough, Sean M.*: YHWH at Patmos: Rev. 1:4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting. 1999. *Volume II/107*.
- McGlynn, Moyna*: Divine Judgement and Divine Benevolence in the Book of Wisdom. 2001. *Volume II/139*.
- Meade, David G.*: Pseudonymity and Canon. 1986. *Volume II/39*.
- Meadors, Edward P.*: Jesus the Messianic Herald of Salvation. 1995. *Volume II/72*.
- Meißner, Stefan*: Die Heimholung des Ketzers. 1996. *Volume II/87*.
- Mell, Ulrich*: Die „anderen“ Winzer. 1994. *Volume II/77*.
- Mengel, Berthold*: Studien zum Philipperbrief. 1982. *Volume II/8*.
- Merkel, Helmut*: Die Widersprüche zwischen den Evangelien. 1971. *Volume II/13*.
- Merklein, Helmut*: Studien zu Jesus und Paulus. *Volume II/1* 1987. *Volume II/43*. – *Volume II/2* 1998. *Volume II/105*.
- Metzler, Karin*: Der griechische Begriff des Verzeihens. 1991. *Volume II/44*.
- Metzner, Rainer*: Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums im 1. Petrusbrief. 1995. *Volume II/74*.
- Das Verständnis der Sünde im Johannesevangelium. 2000. *Volume II/122*.
- Mihoc, Vasile*: see *Dunn, James D. G.*.
- Mittmann, Siegfried*: see *Hengel, Martin*.
- Mittmann-Richert, Ulrike*: Magnifikat und Benediktus. 1996. *Volume II/90*.
- Mußner, Franz*: Jesus von Nazareth im Umfeld Israels und der Urkirche. Ed. von M. Theobald. 1998. *Volume II/11*.
- Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm*: Gesetz und Paränese. 1987. *Volume II/28*.
- Heidenapostel aus Israel. 1992. *Volume II/62*.
- Nielsen, Anders E.*: "Until it is Fulfilled". 2000. *Volume II/126*.
- Nissen, Andreas*: Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum. 1974. *Volume II/15*.
- Noack, Christian*: Gottesbewußtsein. 2000. *Volume II/116*.
- Noormann, Rolf*: Irenäus als Paulusinterpret. 1994. *Volume II/66*.
- Obermann, Andreas*: Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium. 1996. *Volume II/83*.
- Okure, Teresa*: The Johannine Approach to Mission. 1988. *Volume II/31*.
- Oropeza, B. J.*: Paul and Apostasy. 2000. *Volume II/115*.
- Ostmeyer, Karl-Heinrich*: Taufe und Typus. 2000. *Volume II/118*.
- Paulsen, Henning*: Studien zur Literatur und Geschichte des frühen Christentums. Ed. von Ute E. Eisen. 1997. *Volume II/99*.
- Pao, David W.*: Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus. 2000. *Volume II/130*.
- Park, Eung Chun*: The Mission Discourse in Matthew's Interpretation. 1995. *Volume II/81*.
- Park, Joseph S.*: Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions. 2000. *Volume II/121*.
- Pate, C. Marvin*: The Reverse of the Curse. 2000. *Volume II/114*.
- Philonenko, Marc* (Ed.): Le Trône de Dieu. 1993. *Volume II/69*.
- Pilhofer, Peter*: Presbyteron Kreiton. 1990. *Volume II/39*.
- Philippi. *Volume II/1* 1995. *Volume II/87*. – *Volume II/2* 2000. *Volume II/119*.
- see *Ego, Beate*.

- Pöhlmann, Wolfgang*: Der Verlorene Sohn und das Haus. 1993. *Volume 68*.
- Pokorný, Petr and Josef B. Souček*: Bibelauslegung als Theologie. 1997. *Volume 100*.
- Porter, Stanley E.*: The Paul of Acts. 1999. *Volume 115*.
- Prieur, Alexander*: Die Verkündigung der Gottesherrschaft. 1996. *Volume 11/89*.
- Probst, Hermann*: Paulus und der Brief. 1991. *Volume 11/45*.
- Räsänen, Heikki*: Paul and the Law. 1983, <sup>2</sup>1987. *Volume 29*.
- Rehkopf, Friedrich*: Die lukanische Sonderquelle. 1959. *Volume 5*.
- Rein, Matthias*: Die Heilung des Blindgeborenen (Joh 9). 1995. *Volume 11/73*.
- Reinmuth, Eckart*: Pseudo-Philo und Lukas. 1994. *Volume 74*.
- Reiser, Marius*: Syntax und Stil des Markusevangeliums. 1984. *Volume 11/11*.
- Richards, E. Randolph*: The Secretary in the Letters of Paul. 1991. *Volume 11/42*.
- Riesner, Rainer*: Jesus als Lehrer. 1981, <sup>3</sup>1988. *Volume 11/7*.
- Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus. 1994. *Volume 71*.
- Rissi, Mathias*: Die Theologie des Hebräerbriefts. 1987. *Volume 41*.
- Röhser, Günter*: Metaphorik und Personifikation der Sünde. 1987. *Volume 11/25*.
- Rose, Christian*: Die Wolke der Zeugen. 1994. *Volume 11/60*.
- Rüger, Hans Peter*: Die Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza. 1991. *Volume 53*.
- Sänger, Dieter*: Antikes Judentum und die Mysterien. 1980. *Volume 11/5*.
- Die Verkündigung des Gekreuzigten und Israel. 1994. *Volume 75*.
- see *Burchard, Christoph*
- Salzmann, Jorg Christian*: Lehren und Ermahnen. 1994. *Volume 11/59*.
- Sandnes, Karl Olav*: Paul – One of the Prophets? 1991. *Volume 11/43*.
- Sato, Migaku*: Q und Prophetie. 1988. *Volume 11/29*.
- Schaper, Joachim*: Eschatology in the Greek Psalter. 1995. *Volume 11/76*.
- Schimanowski, Gottfried*: Weisheit und Messias. 1985. *Volume 11/17*.
- Schlichting, Günter*: Ein jüdisches Leben Jesu. 1982. *Volume 24*.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J.*: Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul. 1985. *Volume 11/16*.
- Schutter, William L.*: Hermeneutic and Composition in I Peter. 1989. *Volume 11/30*.
- Schwartz, Daniel R.*: Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity. 1992. *Volume 60*.
- Schwemer, Anna Maria*: see *Hengel, Martin*
- Scott, James M.*: Adoption as Sons of God. 1992. *Volume 11/48*.
- Paul and the Nations. 1995. *Volume 84*.
- Siebert, Folker*: Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten. Teil I 1980. *Volume 20* – Teil II 1992. *Volume 61*.
- Nag-Hammadi-Register. 1982. *Volume 26*.
- Argumentation bei Paulus. 1985. *Volume 34*.
- Philon von Alexandrien. 1988. *Volume 46*.
- Simon, Marcel*: Le christianisme antique et son contexte religieux I/II. 1981. *Volume 23*.
- Snodgrass, Klyne*: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants. 1983. *Volume 27*.
- Söding, Thomas*: Das Wort vom Kreuz. 1997. *Volume 93*.
- see *Thüsing, Wilhelm*.
- Sommer, Urs*: Die Passionsgeschichte des Markusevangeliums. 1993. *Volume 11/58*.
- Souček, Josef B.*: see *Pokorný, Petr*.
- Spangenberg, Volker*: Herrlichkeit des Neuen Bundes. 1993. *Volume 11/55*.
- Spanje, T.E. van*: Inconsistency in Paul? 1999. *Volume 11/110*.
- Speyer, Wolfgang*: Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld. *Volume I*: 1989. *Volume 50*.
- *Volume II*: 1999. *Volume 116*.
- Stadelmann, Helge*: Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter. 1980. *Volume 11/6*.
- Stenschke, Christoph W.*: Luke's Portrait of Gentiles Prior to Their Coming to Faith. *Volume 11/108*.
- Stettler, Christian*: Der Kolosserhymnus. 2000. *Volume 11/131*.
- Stettler, Hanna*: Die Christologie der Pastoralbriefe. 1998. *Volume 11/105*.
- Strobel, August*: Die Stunde der Wahrheit. 1980. *Volume 21*.
- Stroumsa, Guy G.*: Barbarian Philosophy. 1999. *Volume 112*.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T.*: Angel Veneration and Christology. 1995. *Volume 11/70*.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter* (Ed.): Das Evangelium und die Evangelien. 1983. *Volume 28*.
- Sung, Chong-Hyon*: Vergebung der Sünden. 1993. *Volume 11/57*.
- Tajra, Harry W.*: The Trial of St. Paul. 1989. *Volume 11/35*.
- The Martyrdom of St. Paul. 1994. *Volume 11/67*.
- Theißen, Gerd*: Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums. 1979, <sup>3</sup>1989. *Volume 19*.
- Theobald, Michael*: Studien zum Römerbrief. 2001. *Volume 136*.
- Theobald, Michael*: see *Mußner, Franz*
- Thornton, Claus-Jürgen*: Der Zeuge des Zeugen. 1991. *Volume 56*.

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*

- Thüsing, Wilhelm*: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie. Ed. von Thomas Söding. 1995. *Volume 82*.
- Thurén, Lauri*: Derhethorizing Paul. 2000. *Volume 124*.
- Treloar, Geoffrey R.*: Lightfoot the Historian. 1998. *Volume II/103*.
- Tsuji, Manabu*: Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung. 1997. *Volume II/93*
- Twelfree, Graham H.*: Jesus the Exorcist. 1993. *Volume II/54*.
- Urban, Christina*: Das Menschenbild nach dem Johannesevangelium. 2001. *Volume II/137*.
- Visotzky, Burton L.*: Fathers of the World. 1995. *Volume 80*.
- Wagener, Ulrike*: Die Ordnung des „Hauses Gottes“. 1994. *Volume II/65*.
- Walter, Nikolaus*: Praeparatio Evangelica. Ed. von Wolfgang Kraus und Florian Wilk. 1997. *Volume 98*.
- Wander, Bernd*: Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten. 1998. *Volume 104*.
- Watts, Rikki*: Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark. 1997. *Volume II/88*.
- Wedderburn, A.J.M.*: Baptism and Resurrection. 1987. *Volume 44*.
- Wegner, Uwe*: Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum. 1985. *Volume II/14*.
- Welck, Christian*: Erzählte 'Zeichen'. 1994. *Volume II/69*.
- Wiarda, Timothy*: Peter in the Gospels. 2000. *Volume II/127*.
- Wilk, Florian*: see *Walter, Nikolaus*.
- Williams, Catrin H.*: I am He. 2000. *Volume II/113*.
- Wilson, Walter T.*: Love without Pretense. 1991. *Volume II/46*.
- Wisdom, Jeffrey*: Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law. 2001. *Volume II/133*.
- Wucherpfennig, Ansgar*: Heracleon Philologus. 2002. *Volume 142*.
- Yeung, Maureen*: Faith in Jesus and Paul. 2002. *Volume II/147*.
- Zimmermann, Alfred E.*: Die urchristlichen Lehrer. 1984, <sup>2</sup>1988. *Volume II/12*.
- Zimmermann, Johannes*: Messianische Texte aus Qumran. 1998. *Volume II/104*.
- Zimmermann, Ruben*: Geschlechtermetaphorik und Geschlechterverhältnis. 2000. *Volume II/122*.

*For a complete catalogue please write to the publisher  
Mohr Siebeck • P.O. Box 2030 • D-72010 Tübingen/Germany  
Up-to-date information on the internet at [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)*

